

Journal of International Studies

Number 9 | 2024

Faculty of International Studies
Kindai University



Journal of International Studies: A scholarly journal of the Faculty of International Studies, Kindai University, consisting of articles, translations, book reviews and other forms of writing that illuminate and raise questions about global issues and international communication and generate discussion and debate on topics across these broad subject areas and related fields.

The Editorial Committee*

Dr Todd Squires, Professor of Japanese Literature (Editor-in-chief)

Dr Yoonok Lee, Professor of Cognitive Linguistics

Dr Yudai Fukuda, Associate Professor of Modern French Literature and
Media History

*All members listed above are full-time faculty members of the Faculty of International Studies, Kindai University.

The journal is available online at
<http://int-studies.kindai.ac.jp/curriculum/journal/>

ISSN: 2432-292X (Print)

ISSN: 2432-2938 (Online)

Published in July 2024

by the Faculty of International Studies, Kindai University,

3-4-1 Kowakae, Higashi-Osaka City, 577-8502 Japan

E-mail: journal@intl.kindai.ac.jp

© 2024 The Faculty of International Studies, Kindai University

Printed in Japan by AP Ryubun Co., Ltd.

Journal of International Studies

Number 9 | 2024

Faculty of International Studies
Kindai University

Contents

Research Articles

A Study on the Similarity of Korean and Japanese Translations of Titles for
Classical Piano Pieces

Yoonok Lee

1

Revisiting Developmental State Theory in East Asia and Latin America

Carlos Ramirez

25

Leo Strauss's Theory on Tyranny: Ancient and Modern

Reimon Sakai

43

Translation

An Annotated Translation of

Huixiang's *Hongzanfahuazhuan juan 2* Fanyi (the first half)

Mio Murata

57

Author Guidelines

클래식 피아노곡에 대한 한·일 번역제목의 유사성 고찰

A Study on the Similarity of Korean and Japanese Translations of Titles for Classical Piano Pieces

이윤옥 (Yoonok Lee) *

ABSTRACT: This paper began with a small observation I made while playing the piano as a hobby in both Korea and Japan, namely that the translated titles of classical piano pieces in Korean and Japanese are remarkably similar. The purpose of this paper is to find out whether this similarity is due to mere chance or based on some concrete cause. I conclude that the reason for the similarity is to be found in the influence that Japan brought to bear on the process of acceptance of Western music in Korea.

KEYWORDS: Classical Piano Piece, Japanese Translation Titles, Korean Translation Titles, Similarity

1. 들어가기

본고는 한국과 일본 두 나라에서 피아노를 취미생활로 한 덕분에 발견한 작은 의문에서 시작되었다. 이 의문은 한국과 일본에서 사용되고 있는 클래식 피아노곡¹의 번역제목이 너무 유사하다는 점이다. 물론 한국어와 일본어는 언어 구조상 유사한 점이 많아 어순이나 문법구조를 변화시키지 않아도 일대일 대응으로 번역이 가능한 텍스트가 있다. 그렇다고 해서 모든 텍스트가 일대일로 대응되는 것은 아니다. 왜냐하면 번역 원문의 언어와 번역 결과물의 언어에는 각각 다른 언어문화가 반영되어 있기 때문이다. 작곡가의 의도와 작품 내용의 함축성을 담아내야 하는 클래식 피아노곡명의 번역에서도 같은 원리가 작용하여 원제목에 대한 한국어 번역제목과 일본어 번역제목이 다르게 생성되는 것이

¹ 클래식 음악은 작곡가 본인이 곡의 제목을 붙인 표제음악과 특별한 제목 없이 곡의 형식과 번호로 부르는 절대음악으로 나뉘어진다. 절대음악에 제목이 붙은 것은 주로 작곡가의 음악을 출판하던 출판사에서 작품의 흥행을 위해 임의로 붙이거나 작품이 인기를 끌면서 대중들 사이에서 작품의 별칭으로 자리 잡은 사례가 대부분이다.

* Professor of Cognitive Linguistics, Faculty of International Studies, Kindai University. E-mail: leigh@intl.kindai.ac.jp

일반적일 것이다².

한 예로, 한류 드라마의 대명사로 자리잡은 ‘겨울연가’의 일본어제목은 ‘겨울 소나타 (冬のソナタ)’ 로 생성되었다. NHK 의 설명에 따르면 연가를 love song 으로 번역해 버리면 뉘앙스가 달라지기 때문에 해외로 수출할 때 변경되었다고 한다³. 또한 ‘겨울연가’에서 주제곡처럼 사용한 ‘하얀 연인들’은 프랑스 영화 ‘13 Jours En France’ 의 주제곡⁴이었다. 이 주제곡의 원제목을 직역하면 ‘프랑스에서 13 일’이 되는데 한국어제목이 ‘하얀 연인들’로 생성된 것은 일본에서 번안한 것을 한국에서도 그대로 가져다 썼기 때문이라고 한다⁵. 이처럼 드라마제목 뿐 아니라 영화제목도 상품 가치를 높이기 위한 전략 등에 따라 번역제목이 다르게 생성되는 것을 확인할 수 있다.

클래식 피아노곡의 한·일 번역제목도 언어문화의 차이와 번역전략 등에 따라 각각 다른 결과물이 생성될 법도 하다. 그런데 클래식 피아노곡의 원제목에 대한 한국어와 일본어의 번역제목은 유사성이 매우 높다. 이 유사성이 우연의 일치로 나타난 현상인지, 아니면 어느 정도 설명 가능한 현상인가 라는 것인데, 필자는 이 현상을 우연의 일치로 보지 않고 서양음악의 수용과정에서 그 답을 찾으려고 한다.

2. 의문의 배경

클래식 피아노곡의 제목 번역에 대한 선행연구는 필자의 관건으로는 전무하다. 그러나 영화제목을 다룬 선행연구를 살펴보면 번역 양상이 다양하게 나타나고 있음을 다음 <표 1>로 알 수 있다.

² 이윤옥 (2020, 2021, 2022, 2023) 참조.

³ <http://ja.wikipedia.org/wiki/>

⁴ 프란시스 레이(Francis Lai)가 만들고, 다니엘 리카리 (Danielle Licari) 가 스캇으로 부른 13 Jours En France (1968 년 작품) 의 주제곡.

⁵ wolfpack.tistory.com

<표 1> 선행연구에서 밝히고 있는 영화 번역제목의 상이⁶

선행연구	선행연구의 결과
尾野治彦 (2004) 「日英語の映画のタイトルにおける表現の違いをめぐって—「感覚のスキーマ」と「行為의 스키ーマ」の観点から—」	서양영화의 원제목과 일본어제목의 비교를 시도한 결과, 일본어 표현과 영어 표현의 차이를 이케가미 (池上: 1999, 2000, 2002) 의 이론 「감각적 스키마」와 「행위적 스키마」로 설명할 수 있었다. 즉 원제목이 직접적이고 직설적인 표현이라면 일본어제목은 감각적이고 필링적인 것으로 영화의 원제목과 일본어 번역제목에는 큰 차이가 있었다.
최지순 (2011) 「Out of Africa 는 愛と哀しみの果てに로 번역될 수 있는가—미국영화제목의 한·일어 번역양상—」	미국영화 제목이 한국과 일본에서 어떻게 번역되고 있는지 아카데미상 작품상 수상작과 2000 년대 개봉한 영화를 대상으로 그 번역 방법을 분석한 결과, 일본어제목이 한국어제목보다 개역을 2 배 가까이 사용된 것은 주목할 점으로 나타났다.
오미형 (2012) 「한국영화의 제목번역 고찰」	영화제목의 번역은 기본적으로 상위 텍스트인 영화 한 편의 일부로서 줄거리에 대한 정보를 제공하고 영화의 매력을 더해 관객의 관람 욕구를 자극한다는 목적을 가지고 있을 뿐 아니라, 문화를 넘나드는 것이기에 때로는 도착어 관객의 문화적 감수성을 고려하여 변형이 가해져야 할 때도 있으며, 국가에 따라 제목 짓기의 관습이 다르고 언어유희 등의 사용으로 인해 언어적인 측면에서 번역의 난제를 제시하기도 한다. 723 편의 한국영화 제목과 이에 대한 영어 번역제목을 분석한 결과, 원제목의 일부 또는 전체를 바꾸는 새로 쓰기와 조절을 합하면 51.2%로 원제목을 그대로 유지하는 직역에 비해 원제목을 변형하는 번역 방법이 조금 더 활용되고 있었다.
조영희 (2014) 「미국 영화제목 번역의 한일 비교」	미국 영화제목이 한국과 일본에서 번역되는 경향을 분석한 결과, 영한 번역의 번역유형은 음역> 직역> 의역> 개역> 기타의 순으로 많고, 영일 번역의 번역유형은 음역> 개역> 의역> 직역> 기타의 순으로 많았다.

<표 1>로 영화제목의 번역 양상은 상이하게 나타나는 것이 일반적이라 하겠다. 그런데 클래식 피아노곡의 한·일 번역제목은 왜 유사성이 높을까? 라는 의문이 본고의 배경인 동시에 출발점이다.

⁶ 필자의 요약을 보기 쉽게 도표화하였다.

3. 분석 자료

클래식 피아노곡의 한·일 번역제목이 유사하게 나타나는 자료는 『피아노 명곡 150 곡』⁷에 수록된 150 작품이다. 초급편 (73 곡) · 중급편 (48 곡) · 상급편 (29 곡) 에 실린 곡을 각각 도표화하여 한·일 제목의 유사성을 제시하고자 한다.

3.1. 자료 【1】

초급편에 실린 73 곡을 도표화하여 작곡가, 원제목, 일본어제목, 한국어제목⁸을 제시한 다음 한·일 간의 번역유형을 살펴보고, 한·일 번역제목이 일대일 대응을 이루지 않는 8 곡에 대해서는 부연 설명으로 유사성의 정도를 제시한다.

<자료 1> 초급편의 73 곡 (■는 일대일 대응이 아닌 것을 나타낸다.)

No	작곡가	원제목	일본어제목	한국어제목
1	J. Krieger	Menuett	メヌエット	미뉴에트
2	C. Petzold	Menuet	メヌエット	미뉴에트 G 장조
3	C. Petzold	Menuet	メヌエット	미뉴에트 G 단조
4	Composer unknown	Polonaise	ポロネーズ	폴로네즈 G 단조
5	Composer unknown	Musette	ミュゼット	뮈제트 D 장조
6	J. S. Bach	Praeludium	前奏曲	프렐류드
7	G. F. Händel	Sarabande	サラバンド	사라반드
8	G. F. Händel	Ombra mai fu	オンブラ・マイ・フ	움브라 마이 푸
9	G. F. Händel	Bourrée	ブーレ	부레
10	D. Scarlatti	Sonata	ソナタ	소나타
11	F. Couperin	Les Petits Moulins à Vent	小さな風車	작은 풍차
12	J. -P. Rameau	Tambourin	タンブラン	탕브랭
13	L. -C. Daquin	Le Coucou	かっこう	삐꾸기
14	W. A. Mozart	Menuett	メヌエット	미뉴에트

⁷ 音楽之友社가 출판한 『ピアノ名曲 150 選』은 명곡이라 불리는 피아노곡을 초급·중급·상급으로 나눠 150 곡을 수록하고 있다. 선곡은 연주회나 발표회 프로그램, 콩쿠르 과제곡, 레슨 병용곡, 악보 판매나 지휘자·학습자·악기점 담당자의 의견 등을 폭넓게 취재해 참고했다는 점에서 본고의 자료로 선정하였다.

⁸ 한국어제목은 한국에서 출판된 피아노 연주곡집에 실려 있는 것을 참조하였다.

15	W. A. Mozart	Menuett	메뉴에트	미뉴에트
16	W. A. Mozart	Allegro	아레그로	알레그로
17	L. v. Beethoven	Romanze	로만첸체	로만체
18	L. v. Beethoven	Menuett G dur	ト調のメニューエット	미뉴에트 G 장조
19	L. v. Beethoven	Für Elise	エリーゼのために	엘리제를 위하여
20	J. N. Hummel	Écossaise	에코세이즈	에코세이즈
21	A. Diabelli	Allegretto	아레그레토	알레그레토
22	F. Schubert	Moments Musicaux III	楽興の時第3番	악흥의 순간 3번
23	F. Chopin	Mazurka	마즐루카	마주르카
24	F. Chopin	Valse	왈츠	왈츠 A 단조
25	F. Chopin	Prélude	前奏曲	전주곡
26	F. Chopin	Prélude	雨だれの前奏曲	빗방울 전주곡
27	R. Schumann	Soldatenmarsch	兵隊の行進	병사의 행진
28	R. Schumann	Wilder Reiter	勇敢な騎士	용감한 기사
29	R. Schumann	Fröhlicher Landmann	楽しき農夫	즐거운 농부
30	R. Schumann	Erster Verlust	初めての悲しみ	첫 슬픔
31	R. Schumann	Träumerei	トロイメライ	트로이메라이
32	R. Wagner	Brautchor	婚礼の合唱	결혼 행진곡
33	T. Osesten	Dolly's Dreaming and Awakening	お人形の夢と目覚め	꿈꾸다 깨어난 인형
34	T. Osesten	Alpenglöckchen	アルプスの鐘	알프스의 종
35	A. Ellmenreich	Spinnerlied	紡ぎ歌	물레의 노래
36	J. Rummel	Tyrolienne	ティロリエンス	티로리앵
37	H. Lichner	In der Tanzstunde	舞踏の時間に	무도의 시간
38	H. Lichner	Forget-Me-Not	忘れな草	물망초
39	C. Gurlitt	Gavotte	ガヴオット	가보트
40	C. Gurlitt	Kleine Romanze	小さなロマンス	작은 로멘스

41	E. Rohde	Die Marionetten	あやつり人形	마리오네트
42	G. Lange	Heidenröslein	荒野のバラ	황야의 장미꽃
43	L. Streabbog	La violette	すみれ	제비꽃
44	E. Waldteufel	Les Patineurs	스케이터즈・왈츠	스케이터즈 왈츠
45	M. Musorgsky	Meditation	冥想	명상
46	P. I. Tchaikovsky	Prière du matin	朝の祈り	아침 기도
47	P. I. Tchaikovsky	Mélodie antique française	프랑스의古い歌	프랑스의 옛 노래
48	P. I. Tchaikovsky	La Sorcière	바바・야가 (魔女)	마녀
49	A. Dvořák	Humoresky	유모레스크	유모레스크
50	T. Badarzewska	La prière d'une vierge	乙女の祈り	소녀의 기도
51	E. Grieg	Arietta	아리에타	아리에따
52	E. Grieg	Solveigs Sang	솔베예그의歌	솔베이그의 노래
53	B. Godard	Berceuse	조슬랭의子守歌	조슬랭의 자장가
54	H. Necke	Csikos Post	크시코스포스트	크시코스의 우편마차
55	E. MacDowell	To a Wild Rose	野ばらに寄せて	들장미에게
56	C. Debussy	The Little Nigar	小さな黒人	작은 흑인
57	E. Satie	l'ère Gymnopédie	짐노페디第1番	짐노페디 제1번
58	E. Satie	l'ère Gnossienne	그노시엔느第1番	그노시엔느 제1번
59	J. E. Jonasson	Kuckucks-Walzer	까っこう왈츠	삐꾸기 왈츠
60	B. Bartók	Játszó gyermekek	遊んでいる子供たち	노는 중인 어린이들
61	B. Bartók	Nagyvásár	にぎやかな市場	큰 시장
62	B. Bartók	Este a székelyeknél	트란실바니아의 타베	트란실바니아풍 으로
63	S. Prokofiev	Tarantelle	타란테라	타란텔라
64	A. Khachaturian	Birthday Party	바스데이・파티어	생일 파티

65	D. Kabalevsky	A Short Story	みじかいお話	짧은 이야기
66	F. Poulenc	Valse Tyrolienne	チロル風のワルツ	티롤풍 왈츠
67	D. Shostakovich	March	マーチ	행진곡
68	Y. Nakada	Etude allegro	エチュード・アレグロ	에튀드 알레그로
69	S. Ikebe	Clouds' Walk	雲の散歩	구름의 산책
70	W. Gillock	Forest Murmurs	森のざわめき	숲의 중얼거림
71	W. Gillock	Sleighbell in the Snow	雪の日のソリのベル	눈 오는 날의 썰매 방울
72	A. Yuyama	Something good may happen!	いいことがありそう!	좋은 일이 있을 것 같아!
73	T. Hirayoshi	A Line Dance of Tulips	チューリップのライ ンダンス	튤립의 라인 댄스

3.1.1. <자료 1>의 고찰

<자료 1>의 번역유형을 확인한 결과, 음역(43.8%)·직역(43.8%)>의역(12.3%)⁹의 순으로 높았다. 그러나 일본어제목은 직역이지만 한국어제목이 음역인 경우가 2 곡 (No. 6 과 No. 41), 일본어제목은 직역이지만 한국어제목이 의역인 경우가 1 곡 (No. 33), 일본어제목은 의역이지만 한국어제목이 직역인 경우가 2 곡 (No. 48 과 No. 70), 일본어제목은 음역이지만 한국어제목이 직역인 경우가 2 곡 (No. 64 과 No. 67) 이었다.

73 곡 중에서 한·일 번역제목이 일대일 대응을 이루지 않는 8 곡 (No. 26, 32, 33, 48, 54, 61, 62, 70) 에 나타나는 유사성의 정도를 차례로 살펴본다.

26	F. Chopin	Prélude	雨だれの前奏曲	빗방울 전주곡
----	-----------	---------	---------	---------

원제목을 직역하면 ‘전주곡’이라는 제목이 된다. 그러나 한·일 번역제목에는 각각 ‘빗방울’과 ‘낙숫물’이라는 부제를 붙여 다른 전주곡들과 구별한다. 주지의 사실이지만 쇼팽은 곡에 제목 붙이는 것을 싫어했으며 듣는 사람들이 곡의

⁹ 본고는 번역유형 자체에 중점을 두는 것이 아니기 때문에 음역 (출발어를 도착어의 발음 규칙에 따라 옮겨 쓴 것), 직역 (출발어의 어휘를 도착어의 대응어로 번역한 것), 의역 (원제목과 번역제목의 어순 및 문법구조가 일치하면서 복수의 번역유형이 사용된 것과 원제목의 어순 및 문법구조가 부분적으로 일치하면서 원제목의 단어 중 일부가 의미상 일대일로 대응하는 도착어 언어의 단어로 치환된 것) 으로 분류하였다.

이미지를 완성하기를 바랐다. 그러나 이 곡이 유명해지자 윈손의 반주가 빗방울을 연상시킨다고 하여 대중들이 붙인 별칭이다. 또한 이 곡에는 쇼팽이 연인 상드¹⁰와 함께 도피한 지중해 섬에서 들은 폭풍으로 인한 빗소리가 새겨져 있다고 한다¹¹. 이러한 상황을 감안하면, 세차게 떨어지는 빗방울과 처마 끝에서 떨어지는 낙숫물은 어휘의 의미 관계에서 유의관계를 나타내는 등 두 제목의 유사성은 높다고 할 수 있다.

32	R. Wagner	Brautchor	婚礼の合唱	결혼 행진곡
----	-----------	-----------	-------	--------

이 곡은 1846-48 년에 가극 「로엔그린」에 나오는 곡으로, 중세의 전설을 바탕으로 바그너 자신이 대본을 쓰고 작곡하였으며, 성배의 기사 로엔그린과 공주의 결혼식장에서 연주된 곡이다. 원제목은 직역하면 ‘신부 합창단’이 되는데 일본어제목은 멘델스존의 ‘결혼행진곡’과 구별하기 위해 ‘혼례의 합창’이라는 제목을 사용한다. 출판사에 따라서는 ‘바그너의 결혼행진곡’으로 표기하는 것을 보더라도 두 제목의 유사성을 충분히 가늠할 수 있다.

33	T. Osesten	Dolly's Dreaming and Awakening	お人形の夢と目覚め	꿈꾸다 깨어난 인형
----	------------	--------------------------------	-----------	------------

원제목은 직역하면 ‘인형의 꿈과 잠에서 깨어남’ 이 될 것이다. 일본어제목은 원제목 그대로 직역한 것에 비해 한국어제목은 어순을 바꾸어 한국어의 어감을 자연스럽게 나타낸 것이라 할 수 있겠다.

48	P. I. Tchaikovsky	La Sorcière	バーバ・ヤガー (魔女)	마녀
----	-------------------	-------------	--------------	----

원제목은 직역하면 ‘마녀’이다. 일본어제목에 쓰여진 ‘바바야거’를 일본어로 번역하면 ‘마녀, 마녀할멈, 요파’등이 된다. 이 제목 또한 한·일 간에 유사한 것을 알 수 있다.

¹⁰ 프랑스 작가 조르주 상드 (1804-1876) 는 쇼팽의 연인이었다. www.chosun.com>culture-life 참조

¹¹ 영어제목은 Raindrop Prelude임을 밝혀둔다.

54	H. Necke	Csikos Post	クシコスポスト	크시코스의 우편마차
----	----------	-------------	---------	------------

크시코스 포스트 (*Csckos Post*) 는 ‘크시코스의 우편마차’라는 제목으로 불리기도 하는데, 원제목의 Csikos[치코슈]는 헝가리어로 ‘말을 타는 사람’을, post[포스트]는 독일어로 ‘우편’을 각각 뜻하며, *Csikos Post* 전체로는 ‘우편마차’라는 뜻이다. 그래서 일본어제목의 하나인 ‘크시코스의 우편마차’는 Csikos 를 지명으로 오해했기 때문에 잘못 붙여졌다는 설이 있어, 현재는 ‘크시코스·포스트’라는 제목이 일반화되어 있다. 원래의 제목은 헝가리 마자르어로 《카우보이의 우편마차》라고 한다¹².

이 번역제목에서 한국어제목이 일본어제목과 유사한 근거를 찾을 수 있을 것 같다. 왜냐하면 근대에 들어온 클래식 피아노곡을 번역할 당시에는 일본어제목도 현재의 한국어제목과 같았을 것이기 때문이다.

61	B. Bartók	Nagyvásár	にぎやかな市場	큰 시장
----	-----------	-----------	---------	------

원제목을 직역하면 ‘대형 시장’으로 한국어제목 ‘큰 시장’과는 일대일 대응을 이루고 있다. 일본어제목 ‘활기찬 시장’도 의미적으로 유사성이 높다고 할 수 있는데, 그 이유는 큰 시장은 언제나 활기에 차 있기 때문이다.

62	B. Bartók	Este a székelyeknél	トランシルヴァニアの夕べ	트란실바니아풍의 로
----	-----------	---------------------	--------------	------------

원제목을 직역하면 ‘헝가리어 방언인 세켈어를 사용하는 사람들이 사는 지역의 저녁’이 된다. 이 직역을 곡명으로 붙이기엔 너무 길어 적합하지 않았을 것이다. 한·일 번역제목에 나타나는 트란실바니아는 세켈어를 사용하는 소수민족이 사는 지방 이름이다. 일본어제목은 그들이 사는 지방의 저녁 풍경을 강조한 것이라면, 한국어제목은 트란실바니아의 지역 문화를 강조한 것으로 설명할 수 있겠다.

70	W. Gillock	Forest Murmurs	森のざわめき	숲의 중얼거림
----	------------	----------------	--------	---------

이 곡은 윌리엄 길록 (W. Gillock) 의 1958 년 작품이다. 숲에서 들을 수 있는

¹² <https://pianoclassics.net/score.php?id=45> 참조

나뭇잎들이 사각거리는 소리를 표현하지만 한·일 번역제목에서는 의인화를 사용하여 마치 숲의 나무들이 중얼거리는 것으로 표현하고 있다. 실제로 이 곡은 숲에서 이는 바람에 나뭇가지나 나뭇잎이 서로 부딪히는 정경을 묘사한 것이라고 한다.

3.1.1.을 통해 한·일 번역제목이 일대일 대응을 이루지 않더라도 사용된 어휘의 의미 관계로 보아 유사성이 높은 것을 확인할 수 있었다.

3.2. 자료 [2]

3.1.과 마찬가지로 중급편에 실린 48 곡을 도표화하여 작곡가, 원제목, 일본어제목, 한국어제목을 제시한 다음 한·일 간의 번역유형을 살펴보고, 번역제목이 일대일 대응을 이루지 않는 8 곡에 대해서는 부연 설명으로 유사성의 정도를 제시한다.

<자료 2> 중급편의 48 곡 (■는 제목이 일대일대응이 아닌 것을 나타낸다.)

No	작곡가	원제목	일본어 제목	한국어 제목
1	J. S. Bach	Gavotte	ガヴオット	가보트
2	G. F. Händel	The Harmonious Blacksmith	調子のいい鍛冶屋	흥겨운 대장간
3	D. Scarlatti	Sonata	ソナタ	소나타 K.380
4	J. Haydn	Hymne “Gott erhalte”	神よ、皇帝フランツを守りたまえ	신이여 프란츠 황제를 보호하소서
5	W. A. Mozart	Variationen über “Ah, vous dirai-je, Maman”	キラキラ星変奏曲	반짝반짝 ■작은 별 변주곡
6	W. A. Mozart	Fantasia	幻想曲	환상곡
7	L. v. Beethoven	Bagatelle	バガテル	바가텔
8	F. Schubert	Valse Sentimentale	感傷的なワルツ	감상적인 왈츠
9	F. Schubert	Valse Noble	高雅なワルツ	우아한 왈츠
10	F. Mendelssohn	Auf Flügeln des Gesanges	歌の翼に	노래의 날개 위에
11	F. Mendelssohn	Jägerlied	狩人の歌	사냥의 노래
12	F. Mendelssohn	Venezianisches Gondellied	ヴェネチアの舟歌	베네치아의 뱃노래
13	F. Mendelssohn	Frühlingslied	春の歌	봄노래
14	F. Chopin	Nocturne	ノクターン	녹턴 2번
15	F. Chopin, op. post	Nocturne	ノクターン 遺作	녹턴 19번

16	F. Chopin	Valse “Petit Chien”	子犬のワルツ	강아지 왈츠
17	F. Chopin	Valse “L’Adieu”	別れのワルツ	이별의 왈츠
18	R. Schumann	Arabeske	アラベスク	아라베스크
19	F. Liszt	Consolation III	コンソレーション第3番	콘솔레이션 3번
20	G. Lange	Blumenlied	花の歌	꽃노래
21	J. Brahms	Walzer	ワルツ	왈츠
22	P. I. Tchaikovsky	Chanson triste	悲しき歌	슬픈 노래
23	P. I. Tchaikovsky	Barcarolle	舟歌	벃노래
24	P. I. Tchaikovsky	Course en Troïka	トロイカ	트로이카
25	A. Durand	Valse	ワルツ	왈츠
26	E. Grieg	Til foråret	春に寄す	봄에 붙여
27	E. Grieg	Noturno	ノクターン	녹턴
28	I. Albéniz	Tango	タンゴ	탱고
29	E. Granados	Andaluza	アンダルーサ	안달루사
30	G. Fauré	Romance sans paroles III	無言歌第3番	무언가 3번
31	C. Debussy	1ère Arabesque	アラベスク第1番	아라베스크 1번
32	C. Debussy	Rêverie	夢	꿈
33	C. Debussy	Golliwogg’s cake walk	ゴリウオグのケーキウォーク	골리워그의 케이크 워크
34	C. Debussy	La Fille aux cheveux de lin	亜麻色の髪の乙女	아마빛 머리의 소녀
35	E. Satie	Je te veux	ジュ・トゥ・ヴ	주뜨브
36	S. Joplin	The Entertainer	エンターテイナー	엔터테이너
37	E. Elgar	Salut d’amour	愛の挨拶	사랑의 인사
38	A. Skryabin	Préludé	前奏曲	전주곡
39	L. Janáček	Dobrou noc!	おやすみ	밤 인사
40	J. Sibelius	The Spruce	樅の木	가문비나무
41	B. Bartók	Joc cu bâță	棒踊り	지팡이의 춤
42	B. Bartók	Brâul	帶踊り	장식띠의 춤
43	B. Bartók	Pe loc	足踏み踊り	제자리걸음 춤
44	B. Bartók	Buciumeana	アルペンホーンの踊り	브춤의 춤

45	B. Bartók	“Poarga” românească	ルーマニアの“ポルカ”	루마니아풍 폴카
46	B. Bartók	Maruntel	速くて細かいステップの踊り	빠른 춤
47	F. Mompou	Pájaro triste	悲しい鳥	슬픈 새
48	T. Yoshimatsu	Nonchalantry Prelude	さりげない前奏曲	아무렇지도 않은 듯한 전주곡

3.2.1. <자료 2>의 고찰

위의 48 곡에 대한 번역유형을 확인한 결과, 일본어제목의 번역유형은 직역 (58.3%) > 음역 (33.3%) > 의역 (8.3%) 의 순이고, 한국어제목의 번역유형은 직역 (56.3%) > 음역 (35.4%) > 의역 (8.3%) 의 순으로 유사하다. 그러나 일본어제목은 직역인데 한국어제목이 의역인 경우가 2 곡 (No. 11, 39) , 일본어제목은 의역인데 한국어제목이 직역인 경우가 1 곡 (No. 44) 으로 나타났다.

48 곡 중에서 한·일 번역제목이 일대일 대응을 이루지 않는 8 곡 (No. 5, 11, 39, 40, 41, 42, 44, 46) 에 대한 유사성의 정도를 차례로 살펴본다.

5	W. A. Mozart	Variationen über “Ah, vous dirai-je, Maman “	キラキラ星変奏曲	반짝반짝 작은 별 변주곡
---	--------------	--	----------	------------------

원제목을 직역하면 ‘아, 어머님께 말씀드리죠’가 되는데, 일본에서는 ‘반짝반짝 별’이라는 별칭으로, 한국에서는 ‘반짝반짝 작은 별’이라는 별칭으로 쓰여지고 있다. 한국에서는 원곡의 멜로디에 영국 시인 제인 테일러 (Jane Taylor) 의 시 ‘반짝반짝 작은 별 (twinkle, twinkle, little star) ’을 노랫말로 하여 동요를 만들었기 때문이다¹³. 그러나 일본어의 노랫말에는 ‘작은’이라는 단어가 나타나지 않는 정도의 차이를 보이고 있다.

11	F. Mendelssohn	Jägerlied	狩人の歌	사냥의 노래
----	----------------	-----------	------	--------

원제목을 직역하면 Hunter’s Song, 즉 ‘사냥꾼의 노래’가 된다. 그러나 어휘의 의미 관계로 보면 한국어제목의 ‘사냥’은 일본어제목에 쓰여진 ‘사냥꾼’의

¹³ terms.naver.com

상위어가 되는 정도로 이 두 제목도 유사성이 높다고 할 수 있다.

39	L. Janáček	Dobrou noc!	おやすみ	밤 인사
----	------------	-------------	------	------

원제목의 체코어 Dobrou noc 를 직역하면 ‘안녕히 주무세요’가 된다. 이 말은 한국어의 밤 인사 표현이다. 제목은 그 작품을 대표하는 이름으로 명사를 사용하는 것이 일반적이다. 일본어제목은 직역인 동시에 명사로 되어 있지만, 직역인 한국어 ‘안녕히 주무세요’는 감탄사로 제목이 되기에는 적합하지 않았던 것으로 간주된다.

40	J. Sibelius	The Spruce	樅の木	가문비나무
----	-------------	------------	-----	-------

원제목의 핀란드어 Spruce 를 직역하면 ‘가문비나무’ 또는 ‘에조마츠 (エゾマツ)’가 된다. 그러나 가문비나무와 전나무는 모양과 크기가 매우 유사하여 학명 (scientific name) 을 따지지 않고는 수목감별이 어렵다고 한다¹⁴. 이러한 점에서 두 제목의 유사성을 이해할 수 있을 것이다.

41	B. Bartók	Joc cu băță	樺踊り	지팡이의 춤
----	-----------	-------------	-----	--------

원제목을 직역하면 ‘지팡이를 이용한 춤’으로 일본어 ‘막대기’와 한국어 ‘지팡이’는 어휘의 의미관계에서 유의관계이므로 두 제목의 유사성이 도출된다.

42	B. Bartók	Brâul	帯踊り	장식띠의 춤
----	-----------	-------	-----	--------

원제목을 직역하면 ‘장식띠를 두른 춤’으로 일본어제목의 ‘띠 춤’과 한국어제목의 ‘장식띠의 춤’은 어휘의 의미 관계에서 상하관계로 No. 41 과 마찬가지로 유사성이 높다. 그뿐 아니라 ‘허리띠 춤’으로 제목을 붙이는 문헌¹⁵도 찾을 수 있었다.

¹⁴ blog.naver.com 참조

¹⁵ 유성윤 (2007: 9)

44	B. Bartók	Buciumeana	アルペンホーンの踊り	브춤의 춤
----	-----------	------------	------------	-------

원제목의 직역은 ‘빨피리 춤’이다. 한국어제목의 ‘브춤’은 일본어제목의 ‘알펜호른’과 비슷한 악기라는 점과, 다른 문헌¹⁶에서 ‘호른의 춤’으로 제목을 붙인 것으로 보아 한·일 번역제목의 유사성을 확인할 수 있다.

46	B. Bartók	Maruntel	速くて細かいステップの踊り	빠른 춤
----	-----------	----------	---------------	------

원 제목을 직역하면 ‘빠른 춤’이 된다. 일본어제목의 ‘빠르고 세밀한 스텝의 춤’은 한국어제목의 ‘빠른 춤’을 더욱 구체적으로 표현한 것일 뿐 의미상으로는 유사하다.

3.2.1. 을 통해서도 한·일 번역제목이 일대일 대응을 이루지 않더라도 어휘의 의미 관계에서 유사도가 높은 것을 확인할 수 있었다.

3.3. 자료 [3]

3.2. 에 이어 상급편에 실린 29 곡을 도표화하여 작곡가, 원제목, 일본어제목, 한국어 제목을 제시한 다음 한·일 간의 번역 유형을 살펴보고 일대일 대응을 이루지 않는 3 곡에 대해서는 부연 설명으로 유사성의 정도를 제시한다.

<자료 3> 상급편의 29 곡 (■는 제목이 일대일 대응이 아닌 것을 나타낸다.)

No	작곡가	원제목	일본어 제목	한국어 제목
1	J. S. Bach	Aria	アリア	아리아
2	W. A. Mozart	Türkischer Marsch	トルコ行進曲	터키 행진곡
3	L. v. Beethoven	Mondschein	月光	월광
4	F. Schubert	Imprompu	即興曲 op. 90-2	즉흥곡 2 번
5	F. Schubert	Impromptu	即興曲 op. 142-2	즉흥곡 142 번
6	F. Chopin	Étude	別れの曲	이별의 곡
7	F. Chopin	Étude	革命のエチュード	혁명
8	F. Chopin	Fantaisie-impromptu	幻想即興曲	환상즉흥곡
9	F. Chopin	Polonaise “Militaire”	軍隊ポロネーズ	군대 폴로네이즈
10	F. Chopin	Polonaise “Héroïque”	英雄ポロネーズ	영웅 폴로네이즈

¹⁶ ibid. (2007: 9)

11	R. Schumann	Aufschwung	飛翔	비상
12	F. Liszt	Liebstraum III	愛の夢第3番	사랑의 꿈 제3번
13	F. Liszt	La campanella	ラ・カンパネッラ	라 캄파넬라
14	J. Brahms	Ungarische Tanz V	ハンガリー舞曲第5番	헝가리 무곡 제5번
15	J. Brahms	Rhapsodie	ラプソディ	랩소디
16	J. Brahms	Intermezzo	間奏曲	인터메조 (간주곡)
17	E. Chabrier	Danse villageoise	村の踊り	마을의 춤
18	C. Debussy	Clair de lune	月の光	달빛
19	S. Joplin	Maple Leaf Rag	メイプルリーフ・ラグ	단풍잎 래그
20	E. Nazareth	Brejeiro	ブレジェイロ	브레제이로
21	A. Rakhmaninov	Prélude	前奏曲「鐘」	전주곡 <모스크바의 종>
22	M. Ravel	Pavane pour une infante défunte	亡き王女のための パヴァーヌ	죽은 왕녀를 위한 파반느
23	M. Ravel	Jeux d'eau	水の戯れ	물의 유희
24	M. de Falla	Danse Rituelle Du Feu	火祭りの踊り	불의 춤
25	N. Medtner	Canzona serenata	夕べの歌	함의 노래
26	B. Bartók	Allegro Barbaro	アレグロ・バルバロ	알레그로
27	S. Prokofiev	The Montagues and Capulets	モンタギュー家と キャピュレット家	몬테규가와 캐플렛가
28	G. Gershwin	Prelude No.1	前奏曲第1番	전주곡 제1번
29	E. Lecuona	Malagueña	マラゲーニャ	말라게냐

3.3.1. <자료 3>의 고찰

위 29 곡의 번역유형을 확인한 결과, 일본어 번역제목의 유형은 직역 (58.6%) > 음역 (24.1%) > 의역 (17.2%) 의 순이고, 한국어제목의 번역유형도 직역 (55.1%) > 음역 (24.1%) > 의역 (20.7%) 순으로 나타났다. 그러나 일본어제목은 직역인데 한국어제목이 음역인 경우가 1 곡 (No. 16), 일본어제목은 음역인데 한국어제목이 의역인 경우도 1 곡 (No. 19) 이었다.

29 곡 중에서 한·일 번역제목이 일대일 대응을 이루지 않는 3 곡 (No. 23, 24, 25) 에 대한 각각의 유사성 정도를 살펴본다.

23	M. Ravel	Jeux d'eau	水の戯れ	물의 유희
----	----------	------------	------	-------

원제목을 직역하면 ‘수상 스포츠’가 된다. 그러나 일본어제목 ‘물의 장난’과 한국어제목 ‘물의 유희’는 의역으로 어휘의 의미관계로는 유의관계이다. 또한 시인 알리 드 레니에 (Henri de Régnier, 1864-1936) 의 ‘물의 간지러움에 미소짓는 냇물의 신’이라는 말이 곡명의 머리말이 되었으며, 거기에 바탕을 두고 곡을 썼다고 한다¹⁷. 이로써 한·일 두 제목은 작곡가의 의도와 작품 내용의 함축성을 담아낸 점에서도 유사성이 높다고 할 수 있다.

24	M. de Falla	Danse Rituelle Du Feu	火祭りの踊り	불의 춤
----	-------------	-----------------------	--------	------

원제목은 ‘불 의식의 춤’으로 일본어제목과는 일대일 대응을 이루고 있다. 한국어제목도 출판사에 따라 ‘불의 춤 (불 의식의 춤)’ 으로 표기하는 것을 보면 유사한 제목으로 번역된 것이라 할 수 있다.

25	N. Medtner	Canzona serenata	夕べの歌	밤의 노래
----	------------	------------------	------	-------

원제목을 직역하면 ‘세레나데의 노래’ 즉 소야곡이며, ‘저녁 음악’이라는 뜻이다. 일본어제목에서 쓰여진 시간은 ‘저녁’이고 한국어제목에서 쓰여진 시간은 ‘밤’이라는 정도의 차이를 보이고 있다.

3.3.1. 에서도 한·일 번역제목에 사용된 어휘가 일대일 대응을 이루지 않더라도 어휘의 의미 관계 등에서 유사성이 매우 높은 것을 확인할 수 있었다.

4. 의문에 대한 해답의 모색

본고의 출발점이 된 클래식 피아노곡의 한·일 번역제목이 왜 유사하게 생성되었을까? 라는 의문에 대한 답을 찾기 위해 한국의 서양음악 수용과정을 모색해 본다.

4.1. 서양음악의 수용과정

클래식 피아노곡의 한·일 번역제목이 유사하게 생성된 것은 우연의 일치가

¹⁷ 堀内久美雄 (2019: 184)

아니라 필연적 결과임을 제시하기 위해 서양음악의 수용과정을 고찰한 선행연구를 탐색하고자 한다.

서양음악의 전래와 수용에 관한 선행연구로는 (1) 「서양음악의 수용과 아시아 — 한국·중국·일본·타이완의 초기 수용과정을 중심으로 —」 (민경찬: 2005), (2) 「서양음악의 전래와 수용」 (박혜정: 2005), (3) 「일본 식민지 시기 서양음악의 수용과 그 정치적 의미」 (이경분: 2010), (4) 「피아노와 근대-초기 한국 피아노음악의 사회사」 (김미현: 2010), (5) 「植民地朝鮮における日本人音楽家による音楽会—韓国西洋音楽受容史の一側面として—」 (金志善: 2016) 가 있다.

위의 선행연구를 탐색함으로써 클래식 피아노곡의 한·일 번역제목이 유사한 이유를 도출하려고 한다. 클래식 피아노곡의 원제목을 한국어로 번역하는 과정에는 자의든 타의든 일본의 영향이 컸을 것이라는 전제하에 논지를 전개시켜 나갈 것이다.

4.1.1. 선행연구 1

민경찬 (2005: 112-116) 은 한국에 서양음악이 본격적으로 수용된 시기를 19 세기 중엽으로 보고 일본의 경우와 한국의 경우를 다음과 같이 설명하였다.

<표 2> 한일 양국의 서양음악 수용 양상¹⁸

일본의 경우	한국의 경우
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 일본에 서양음악이 처음 유입된 시기를 대개 16 세기 후반인 무로마찌시대 (室町時代) 말기로 보고 있다. • 1858 년 ‘개국 (開國)’ 과 함께 외국인 선교사들이 합법적으로 입국할 수 있게 되었다. • 이 당시 입국한 선교사들은 향후 일본에 서양음악을 보급하는 데 있어 나름대로 역할을 하게 된다. • 일본에 서양음악이 정착하는 데 있어 결정적인 역할을 한 그룹은 미국에서 파견된 여성 선교사들로 초기 찬송가와 오르간 교육을 담당했다. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1876 년 강화도 조약을 계기로 ‘개항 (開港)’ 을 하게 되면서 서양음악이 들어오기 시작하였다. • 소위 ‘개화기’ 라고 일컫는 이 시기에 기독교 선교사들이 선교활동을 위해 입국하였다. • 이 당시 입국한 선교사들은 찬송가를 가르쳤는데, 이 음악활동은 향후 한국에 양악이 정착하는 요인이 된다. • 한국의 음악교육은 선교사의 입국 및 찬송가의 도입과 함께 시작되었으며, 이들은 찬송가와 오르간, 그리고 간단한 음악이론을 가르쳤다.

¹⁸ 필자에 의한 요약에 도표화하였다.

<표 2> 에서 알 수 있듯이 일본은 한국보다 서양음악의 수용이 선행되었다. 서양음악의 수용 통로는 교회였으며, 선교사는 서양음악의 교사 역할을 하는 동시에 일본과 한국의 초기 서양음악사에 큰 영향을 주었음을 시사하고 있다.

4.1.2. 선행연구 2

서양음악이 한국에 소개된 것은 서양음악 유입의 시발로 생각하고 있는 19 세기 말엽보다는 훨씬 앞선다. 그러나 이 과정을 명실상부한 서양음악의 유입이라고 보기는 어렵다. 본격적인 서양음악의 유입은 개항 이후 시작된 개신교 음악의 상륙에서 찾는 것이 순리라고 하겠다¹⁹. 개화에 따른 개신교 음악의 전래에 대해 일본과의 관계를 알 수 있는 대목을 박혜정 (2005) 에서 인용하면 다음 (1) 과 같다.

- (1) 1881 년 신사유람단의 일원으로 일본에 건너갔던 안중수와 이수정은 일본에서, 1883 년에는 미국 선교사로부터 세례를 받았다. (중략) 격동의 19 세기 후반에 서양식 곡조로 된 일본의 ‘창가 (唱歌)’가 한국으로 들어와 교과서에 실리게 된다. 그 후 한일합방과 더불어 총독부에 의해 교과서의 개정판이 나왔으며, 개정판에 실린 수 편의 노래가 전형적인 일본 음계에 의해 작곡되고, 심지어는 일본 국내의 창가 교과서에서 그대로 옮겨 놓은 일본 노래의 출현까지도 볼 수 있었다.

— 박혜정 (2005: 238-250) (필자 요약)

위의 인용문으로 한국의 서양음악 수용과정에 일본의 영향이 얼마나 컸을지 짐작하고도 남음이 있다. 또한 한국 창작 창가 및 창작 음악의 효시라는 역사적 의의를 갖는 ‘학도가’에 나타나는 한국 창가의 특징을 다음 (2)와 같이 밝히고 있다.

- (2) 장음계지만 ‘도레미솔라’로 된 이유는 서양음악을 수용하는 과정에서 발생된 ‘음악번역현상’으로 볼 수 있다. (중략) 새로운 창작곡 ‘학도가’ 역시 서양의 장음계를 사용하면서도 반음이 생략된 형태로 만든 것이다. 이것은 후에 ‘도레미솔라’의 요나누키 장음계로 만들어진 일본 창가의 영향을 받아 한국 창가의 특징으로 등장하게 된다.

¹⁹ 박혜정(2005:237)

— ibid (250-251) (필자 요약)

위의 (1)에 더해 한국의 음악이 일본으로부터 받은 영향을 확인할 수 있다. 이러한 점을 감안할 때, 클래식 피아노곡명을 번역하는 과정에도 일본의 영향은 불가피했을 것이라는 필자의 주장에 힘이 실린다.

4.1.3. 선행연구 3

이경분 (2010)의 연구는 식민지 시기 한국사회에서 서양고전음악이 어떻게 수용되었는지를 고찰한 것이다. 서양음악이 20세기 초반에 한국에서 수용된 배경과 의미를 당시의 잡지, 신문, 소설 등의 자료를 바탕으로 다양한 측면에서 살펴보고 정리하였는데, 가려서 간단히 정리하면 다음 (3)과 같다.

- (3) 본격적인 일본 식민지 시기가 되면서 전에 들어보지 못한 유성기 음반에서 흘러나오는 트로트, 재즈 음악, 또 피아노와 바이올린과 같은 서양음악 악기 소리는 한국인들의 귀를 놀라게 하면서 이전과는 다른 생활 감각과 정서를 느끼게 하였다. 서양클래식음악은 대중적 기반이 그리 크지 않았고, 가장 복잡하고 접근하기 힘든 음악이었지만, 대중음악보다 훨씬 다양한 차원에서 수용되었다.

1930년대에 일본에서 전문적으로 음악 공부를 한 한국 음악인들이 많아지는 현상과 예술로서의 음악이라 말할 수 있는 수용현상이 서로 맞물려 있었다. 다시 말해, 1920년대 조선총독부의 유학 정책이 달라진 이후, 음악을 공부하고자 하는 학생들이 대거 일본으로 유학을 가고 또 귀국하게 되는 현상, 즉 앞선 일본의 음악 문화를 접하고 돌아온 전문 음악가의 수가 많아진 것이 음악을 예술로 인식하게 되는 하나의 전제 조건이었으리라 추측하였다.

초기 서양 선교사를 통해서 교회와 밀접한 관련이 있었던 기독교적 음악관이나 학예회 정도의 음악 수준은 1930년대 유학 세대가 대거 일본에서 전문적 음악교육을 받고 돌아오면서 서서히 달라졌다. 그러므로 한국에서 이전에 보지 못한 예술로서의 음악 현상이 정식으로 음악을 공부한 세대들이 많아지는 1930년대 전후가 되어서 등장하는 것도 우연이 아니었다. 외국유학생들이 귀국하여 예술로서의 연주회를 선보이게 되는 1930년의 연주회 레퍼토리는 베토벤, 슈코프스키, 멘델스존, 리스트 등이었다. 이들

연주자들은 모두 동경고등음악학원 출신 음악가들이었다.

친일음악단체 경성후생실내악단의 제 1 회 연주회 (1942 년 6 월 11 일) 의 프로그램을 보면, 오펜바흐, 쇼팽, 푸치니, 브람스, 베르디, 베버 등의 서양음악 레퍼토리와 당시 프로파간다 노래로 반드시 한국 정도 연주회에서 불러야 했던 <대일본의 노래> (大日本の歌) 가 포함되어 있다.

— 이경분 (2010: 169-172) (요약 필자)

위의 (3)을 통해 확인할 수 있는 것은 ①한국인들은 일제강점기에 들어서 처음으로 피아노와 같은 서양악기 소리를 듣게 되었다는 점 ②서양클래식음악이 한국 사회에 수용된 배경에는 일본에서 전문적 음악교육을 받은 음악가들이 대거 등장했다는 점 ③일본에서 전문적 음악교육을 받은 유학파들이 선보인 연주회의 레퍼토리를 알 수 있다는 점 ④특히 이들은 모두 동경고등음악학원 출신이라는 점이다.

이러한 점들을 미루어 볼 때 클래식 피아노곡의 한국어 번역제목은 일본어 번역제목의 영향을 받았을 것이라는 추론이 가능해진다.

4.1.4. 선행연구 4

김미현 (2010) 의 연구는 근대 피아노문화를 사회학적 관점으로 고찰한 것인데, 피아노의 등장과 초기 피아니스트들의 활동 상황을 다음 (4)와 같이 규명하고 있다.

- (4) 19 세기 말 조선은 일본을 통해 서구 근대를 수용하기 시작했다는 것은 여러 문헌을 통해 확인 가능하다. 피아노음악도 예외는 아니어서 신문명의 침병이자, 조선 근대음악의 표상으로 화려하게 등장하게 되었다.

조선의 초기 피아니스트들의 음악 입문은 주로 선교사들에 의해서 세워진 교회 및 근대식 학교를 통해 이루어졌다. 그러나 이들은 국내 학습 과정을 마치고 해외로 유학을 떠나는 경우가 많았다. 그들은 주로 일본 동경으로 향했지만 일부는 미국이나 독일로 떠났다. 유학에서 돌아온 그들은 교육계에 정착하여 연주 활동도 겸하게 된다. 이 시기의 피아노 독주를 위한 레퍼토리는 주로 서양의 고전 · 낭만시기에 한정되었다. 왜냐하면, 모차르트 · 베토벤 · 멘델스존 · 슈만 · 쇼팽 · 브람스 등의 작곡가들의 곡들이

지배적이었기 때문이다.

그러나 그들은 1930년대 중반, 일제의 황민화 정책에 따라 일부는 조선총독부의 관제 음악단체인 조선문예회의 설립에 참여했고, 일부는 국민정신총동원운동의 일환으로 조직된 경성음악협회의 설립에 참여했으며, 일부는 일본의 국방국가 체제 확립을 목적으로 조직된 국민총력조선연맹의 문화부 위원으로 선임되었다. 또한 일부는 조선음악계의 신체제운동을 목표로 한 조선음악협회의 조직 발기인회에 참여하기도 했다.

— 김미현 (2010: 158-178) (필자 요약)

즉 근대 한국의 초기 피아니스트들의 대부분은 일본에서 유학하였다. 이들 일본 유학파들은 귀국 후 교육계에 자리를 잡았으며, 나중에는 조선총독부의 관제 음악단체에도 몸을 담았다. 이러한 사실을 감안하면 당시에 들어온 클래식 피아노곡명의 번역 과정에는 이들 피아니스트들의 역할과 영향력을 배제할 수 없을 것이다.

4.1.5. 선행연구 5

金志善 (2016)의 연구는 일제강점기 (1910-1945) 조선에서 일본 음악가들이 조선을 일시 방문하여 실시한 클래식 음악회의 실태를 고찰한 것이다. 당시의 신문이나 잡지 등의 기사를 탐색하여, 그들이 진행한 음악회가 한국 서양음악의 수용사에 어떤 역할을 했는지에 대해 다음 (5)와 같이 정리하였다.

- (5) 1920년대에 들어서자 일본이나 유럽에서 유학을 경험한 조선인 음악가들에 의해 본격적인 클래식 음악회가 열리게 되었다. 조선인 음악가들의 본격적인 서양음악 음악회가 열리게 된 것은 1920년대 이후의 일이다. 1920년대는 미션계 학교를 중심으로 일본 도쿄음악학교에서 유학한 김영환, 홍난파, 윤심덕, 한기주의 연주회가 주로 이루어졌다. 조선에서는 1923년 2월 개척를 효시로 하여 저명한 해외 음악가들의 음악회도 자주 열렸다. 조선을 방문한 음악가는 Fritz Kreisler, Giorgio Ronconi, Jascha Heifetz 등이며, 그들의 음악회로 조선에 있어서의 클래식 음악계는 질적, 양적으로 크게 향상하게 되었다. 해외의 저명한 음악가에 의한 클래식 음악회 중에는 물론 일본인 음악가의 음악회도 포함된다.

조선에서 클래식 음악을 즐길 수 있는 층은 한정되어 있었을

것이며, 이들은 중고등 교육을 받은 지식층들로 대부분 경제적 여유도 따르는 사람들이었을 것이다. 이들이 서양음악을 선호할 수 있었던 요인 중 하나로 꼽은 것이, 학교교육으로서의 창가와 음악교육을 통해 서양적 음악을 배우고 음악적 기초를 얻은 데 있었다고 한다. 그리고 일본인 중등 음악 교원에 의해 교육을 받은 엘리트 학생은, 후에 클래식 음악을 애호할 수 있는 층으로서 정착했다고 할 수 있다. 이들은 후에 관공서, 학교기관, 금융기관, 신문이나 잡지사 등에 취직하여 조선의 인텔리겐치아로서 클래식 음악을 향유하는 층이 되었을 것으로 예측된다.

— 金志善 (2016: 29-36) (필자 요약)

위의 (5)를 통해 일본에서 유학한 음악가들은 물론, 일본인 교원에 의해 음악교육을 받은 이들은 한국의 교육기관이나 출판사 등에서 클래식 피아노곡명의 한국어 번역에도 몸담았을 것이라는 예측은 빗나가지 않을 것이다.

이러한 점을 감안하여 클래식 피아노곡의 한·일 번역제목이 유사한 것은 우연의 일치가 아닌 일제강점기의 일본의 영향으로 인한 필연적 결과라고 주장하는 것이다.

5. 나오기

본고는 한국과 일본에서 출판된 클래식 피아노 연주곡집에 실려 있는 피아노곡의 한·일 번역제목이 유사하다는 점에 의문을 가지고 출발하였다. 왜냐하면 영화나 드라마의 번역제목은 상이하게 생성되는 것이 일반적이었기 때문이다.

본고에서는 『피아노 명곡 150선』에 실려 있는 클래식 피아노 150곡의 한·일 번역제목을 고찰하였다. 번역유형에서도 유사성이 높게 나타났다. 특히 초점을 맞춰 살펴본 번역제목의 유사성은 150곡 중 131곡 (87.4%)이 한·일 간에 일대일 대응을 이루었다. 일대일 대응을 이루지 않는 19곡 (12.6%)에 대해서는 각각 부연 설명으로 양자의 유사성 정도를 살펴보았다. 이 19곡의 한·일 번역제목이 일대일 대응을 이루지 않더라도 사용된 어휘의 의미 관계 등에서 상당 부분 유사성을 확인할 수 있었다.

클래식 피아노곡명의 번역이 언제 누구에 의한 결과물인지는 자료 부족으로 명확하지 않다. 그러나 근대 한국에서 서양음악은 교회 선교사나 일본을 통해 들어왔다는 역사적 사실은 여러 문헌을 통해 확인할 수 있었다. 즉 서양음악의

수용 통로는 교회였으며 선교사는 서양음악의 교사 역할을 하면서 한·일 초기 서양음악사에 큰 영향을 주었다. 또한 일본을 통한 수용 경로에는 35 년간의 일제강점기라는 역사적 배경과 시기가 맞물리고 있었다.

음악사에서 뿐 아니라 전반적인 역사의 흐름에서 일제의 영향력이 강화된 일제강점기에 서양고전음악이 본격적으로 한국에 들어왔다. 이 시기에 활동한 주요 인물들의 대부분이 일본 유학파라는 점은 시사하는 바가 매우 크다고 본다. 동아시아 최초의 서양음악 전문 교육기관인 도쿄음악학교를 졸업하고 한국으로 귀국한 음악가들은 한국의 교육기관이나 출판사 등에서 활동한 점도 확인되었다. 필자는 이들이 클래식 피아노곡명의 한국어 번역에도 몸담았을 것이라는 추론과 함께 자의든 타의든 일본의 영향을 받을 수밖에 없었을 것이라고 주장하는 것이다.

이러한 점들을 미루어 볼 때, 클래식 피아노곡의 번역제목이 한·일 간에 유사성이 높은 것은 우연의 일치가 아닌 서양음악의 수용기간이 일제강점기와 맞물리고 있었다는 점에서 일본의 영향으로 인한 필연적 결과로 보는 것이다.

참고문헌

- 김미현 (2010) 「피아노와 근대-초기 한국 피아노음악의 사회사」 『한국음악학학회』 pp. 153-187.
- 김지혜·정호봉 (2014) 「일제 강점기 교육령에 따른 교육확대과정과 학교 음악교육 정책연구」 『한국음악연구』 Vol.56. pp.63-86.
- 노동은 (1996) 『한국근대음악사 【1】』 한길사.
- 민경찬 (2005) 「서양음악의 수용과 아시아-한국·중국·일본·타이완의 초기 수용과정을 중심으로—」 『계간 낭만음악』 제 17 권 제 4 호 (통권 68 호), pp.99-139.
- 박혜정 (2005) 「서양음악의 전래와 수용 —1880 대를 기점으로 한 개화기 중심으로 —」 『국악과 교육』 제 23 권 pp.231-266.
- 신대철 (2005) 「한국·중국·일본의 서양음악 수용」 『한국음악연구』 제 38 집, pp. 143-172.
- 오미형 (2012) 「한국영화의 제목번역 고찰」 『번역학연구』 제 13 권 1 호, pp.59-85.
- 유성운 (2007) 「벨라 바르토크가 추구한 민족 음악적 특징 : 바이올린과 피아노를 위한 “루마니아 민속춤곡”을 중심으로」 조선대학교대학원 석사논문.
- 이경분 (2010) 「일본 식민지 시기 서양음악의 수용과 그 정치적 의미」 『音·樂·學』 제 18 권 제 1 호, pp.155-185.
- 이윤옥 (2020) 「일본영화 “너의 체장을 먹고 싶어”의 한국어 자막에 나타나는 이문화 요소」 *Journal of International Studies*, No. 5, pp.19-41. (近畿大学国際学部紀要).
- (2021) 「한·일 자막 번역에 나타나는 필러의 대조언어학적 연구—일본영화

- “너의취장을 먹고 싶어”를 대상으로—」 *Journal of International Studies*, No. 6, pp.35-57. (近畿大学国際学部紀要).
- (2022) 「한·일 자막 번역에 나타나는 역할어의 대조언어학적 연구—일본영화 “너의 취장을 먹고 싶어”를 대상으로—」 *Journal of International Studies*, No. 7, pp.33-49. (近畿大学国際学部紀要) .
- (2023) 「한·일 자막 번역에 나타나는 호칭어의 대조언어학적 연구—일본영화 “너의 취장을 먹고 싶어”를 대상으로—」 *Journal of International Studies*, No. 8, pp.1-23. (近畿大学国際学部紀要).
- 조영희 (2014) 「미국 영화제목 번역의 한일 비교」 『통번역학연구』 제 18 권 4 호, pp. 274-294.
- (2014) 「한일 영화제목 번역 전략 비교」 『日本文化學報』第 61 輯, pp.43-61.
- 최지순 (2011) 「*Out of Africa* 는 愛と哀しみの果て로 번역될 수 있는가 : 미국영화제목의 한·일어 번역양상」 중앙대학교 석사논문.
- 金志善 (2016) 「植民地朝鮮における日本人音楽家による音乐会—韓国西洋音楽受容史の一側面として—」 東京藝術大学音楽学部『紀要』、第 42 集、pp.27-47.
- 權惠根 (2009) 「韓国近・現代의 音樂教育 研究—韓·日 音樂 教育課程의 比較」 成均館大学校大学院 博士論文.
- 尾野治彦 (2004) 「日英語の映画のタイトルにおける表現の違いをめぐって—「感覚のスキーマ」と「行為のスキーマ」の観点から—」 北海道武蔵女子短期大学『紀要』 36、pp.66-74.
- 權周瑢·吳知錫·李秀京 (2022) 「近代韓国における西洋宣教師の教育活動と西洋音楽」 東京学芸大学紀要『人文社会科学系 1』 73、 pp.189-208.
- 門馬直美 (1976) 『西洋音楽史 概説』 春秋社。
- 堀内久美雄 (2020) 『ピアノ名曲 150 選 初級編』 音楽之友社。
- 堀内久美雄 (2020) 『ピアノ名曲 150 選 中級編』 音楽之友社。
- 堀内久美雄 (2019) 『ピアノ名曲 150 選 上級編』 音楽之友社。

Revisiting Developmental State Theory in East Asia and Latin America

Carlos Ramirez *

ABSTRACT: The concept of the developmental state is seminal to analyzing both the economic success of East Asian nations and the failure to achieve such success at the same level for Latin American countries. The main argument here is that the internal political, social, and economic maturity of a society shapes the form of its integration into global society and international markets. The greater the maturity, the less vulnerable a nation is to external political and economic shocks. Thus, the analysis of the problems of economic development must emphasize domestic factors for the economic outcomes of a nation. These factors include primarily state-society relations and the balance of class forces within society. The configuration of social forces permitted the state in East Asia to coordinate local industrialists, international capital, and society at large in a national effort towards economic transformation. In so doing, it was able to shape, and not be shaped by, the international environment. This was not the case in Latin America where the state was essentially captured by outside interests. An alliance of local industrialists, labor, and the state, with the support of transnational capital, led the way towards a regrettable strategy of slow growth, inequality, and poverty.

KEYWORDS: Developmental State; Development Theory; Economic Growth; East Asia; Latin America

Introduction

The idea of a strong, capable state at the center of national progress and growth is an old idea in the field of development economics. However, the recent return to industrial policies as a result of growing inequality and de-industrialization in the USA and other developed nations has given added prominence to the role of the state in economic growth. It is clear that both developing and developed economies are now converging on confronting the same set of social problems. As Rodrik (2022) argues, “policymakers in advanced economies are now grappling with the same questions that have long preoccupied developing economies: how to attract investment, create jobs, increase skills, spur entrepreneurship, and enhance access to credit and technology” (para. 7). Given this situation, a revisiting of the role of the

* Associate Professor of International Relations, Faculty of International Studies, Kindai University. Email: cramirez@intl.kindai.ac.jp

Ramirez, C. (2024). Revisiting Developmental State Theory in East Asia and Latin America. *Journal of International Studies*, 9, 25-41.
©2024 Carlos Ramirez

state in social development and economic growth in responding to these challenges is warranted.

This article will limit its geographical scope to the historical role of the state in East Asia and Latin America and leave aside the ongoing raging debate on the merits of current state intervention in developed economies (see, for example, Muro, 2023). Yet, advanced countries have much to learn from the experience and outcomes of these two regions which have experimented with interventionist bureaucracies for long periods of time. The concept of the developmental state is seminal to analyzing both the economic success of East Asian nations and the failure to achieve such success at the same level for Latin American countries. There are other theories that could be applied to the economic development of these regions but, as will be discussed below, these fall short in providing satisfactory explanations for their corresponding results. The main argument here is that the internal political, social and economic maturity of a society shapes the form of its integration into global society and international markets. The greater the maturity, the less vulnerable a nation is to external political and economic shocks. Thus, the analysis of the problems of economic development must emphasize domestic factors for the economic outcomes of a nation. These factors include primarily state-society relations and the balance of class forces within society.

This article is divided into three sections. The first section will provide an overview of other possible explanatory theories before reviewing developmental state theory in detail. In the second section, the origins of developmental state theory are explored together with an examination of the characteristics of the developmental state itself. Finally, the last section will attempt to provide some initial postulations on the creation of a developmental state. Assuming a developmental state is desirable, then it is essential to understand how one is brought into existence.

Explaining Development Outcomes: Theories of Development

The accomplishments attained by countries in East Asia and Latin America can be explained through a variety of theories. The principal ones discussed here are institutionalist thought, classical and neoclassical economic theories, Marxism and its offshoot in the development context, dependency theory, and finally developmental state theory. In this section, there will be a brief overview of these main theories and then they are compared to the developmental state paradigm.

Modern development has occurred over the past two hundred years in three distinct phases. According to Amsden (1989), the first phase by northern European nations was an example of applied classical economics and free trade. The second phase or late-industrializer phase, in which Germany and the Soviet Union were the prime examples, was mainly achieved through infant industry protection. In the third or late- late-industrialization phase, countries such as Japan, South Korea, Taiwan, and China were characterized by the subsidy, principally the allocation of credit on a preferential basis, coupled with protection.

In all three phases, the state has played some role in the economy albeit more

important in the two latter phases. In order to gain a better understanding of the different political economies at work, Johnson (1982) together with Henderson and Appelbaum (1992) provide a schema to explain the different roles the state plays under each type of political economy. The first type is the market-ideological economy. Henderson and Appelbaum (1992) labeled the state in modern Western countries in the 1980s as “market-ideological”. The market-ideological state relies on an intellectual tradition that ignores or is impervious to evidence that may contradict the theory (Henderson & Appelbaum, 1992, p.19). The Reagan-Bush and Thatcherite market-ideological sets of policies are well known and have been labeled as neoliberal. These policies included the withdrawal of the state from society through deregulation, tax reduction, limits on fiscal policy, privatization of state assets, and reduction of social welfare outlays. All of the latter was done in the belief that free markets will always have the desired effect.

The second type is the market-rational economy. Johnson identifies this political economy with most western democracies before the neoliberal period of the 1980s particularly the period after the Industrial Revolution. The state in these countries after the Industrial Revolution had little to do with economic activities. Economic development was mostly a spontaneous result of invention and innovation associated with 19th century advances in technology and engineering (i.e., electricity and the steam engine). At best, the state since the turn of the century has performed a regulatory, or market-rational, function: “the state concerns itself with the forms and procedures – the rules if you will – of economic competition, but it does not concern itself with substantive matters” (Johnson, 1982, p.19). Thus, the market-rational state provides the overall framework within which business can make investment and production decisions efficiently.

Johnson applies the term plan-ideological economies to the third type of political economy. Direct state ownership of the means of production, state planning, and bureaucratic goal setting are not only means to development but also ideological values in themselves, and, not unlike the market-ideological economy “are not to be challenged by evidence of either inefficiency or ineffectiveness” (Johnson, 1982, p.18). The command economies of the Soviet Union and its allies would fall under this category as would the Chinese economy under Chairman Mao in the 1950s to 1970s.

The plan-rational state is the final category of political economy according to Johnson. It is different from all the above essentially because, in addition to providing a framework of rules and regulations for market actors – similar to the market-rational model – the state does not hesitate to intervene to support private commerce. It will do this if it deems a certain industry to be crucial to national interest and this industry is unable to sustain itself. In order to achieve economic goals, however, the state must act, above all, in a pragmatic manner (unlike plan-ideological or market-ideological states). Ideology is not an important factor in economic development; only satisfactory economic and social outcomes are acknowledged.

Each different theory that attempts to explain the development outcomes of the two regions underpins one of the models of political economy outlined above. Neoclassical economics has the closest affinity to the market-ideological economy. At the core of neoclassical economics is the belief that free markets trump all other

concerns. In the words of Wade (2018), neoclassical economics claims that “competition between private economic agents is the only legitimate, reliably welfare-enhancing organizing principle for human activity” (p. 519). State intervention is discouraged as the costs related to diminished competition and the inefficient allocation of resources will be higher than the economic gain from them. According to neoclassicists, the negative impact of state intervention is not only in the economy but also in society as individual liberty is also eroded (Wade, 2018, p. 519).

Neoclassical economics views the success of East Asia as the result of its adherence to what was called in the 1990s the *Washington Consensus*. The Washington Consensus consisted of policies including free markets, deregulation, tax reductions, and open trade. John Williamson (1993) who coined the term addressed East Asia’s success as follows: “the superior economic performance of countries [i.e., East Asian nations] that establish and maintain outward-oriented market economies subject to macroeconomic discipline is essentially a positive question. The proof may not be quite as conclusive as the proof that the Earth is not flat, but it is sufficiently well established...” (p. 1331). Conversely, the failure of Latin America to attain long lasting success is the absence of these Washington Consensus policies in its macroeconomic framework. Too much reliance on state intervention and protection of industry from global markets has doomed Latin America to unacceptable levels of poverty and inequality (see Lal, 1983).

Since the 1990s, there have been many recantations and retractions of this narrative including from Williamson (2004) himself. The World Bank in the 1990s after much pressure from the government of Japan led a large research project to investigate the factors of success for East Asia (Wade, 2018). It came to the conclusion that indeed the government’s role in the economy was an important factor in the economic achievements of these countries: that once the state had built public infrastructure, established a legal system to ensure a rule of law bound society and created macro-economic stability, this would engender a virtuous cycle of economic growth and development (see World Bank, 1993).

These conclusions conform to the theory of institutionalism that suffuses the market-rational political economy. For institutionalists, a legal framework that enforces the rule of law will reduce transaction costs among private market agents. Without a public legal rubric, the costs of doing business increase as there is no recourse to the courts in the event of business disagreements. Thus, such a legal predicament would require the cost to be privatized through the establishment of private arbitration and security services. In the case of East Asian economic success, however, it is quite clear that states have gone well beyond providing only a legal framework and basic public infrastructure. Industry protection through tariff and non-tariff barriers, subsidies and control over credit are just some of the extensive policies that were used to generate industrial transformation and high-speed growth.

Much of the criticism of neoclassical and institutionalist thought originated from Marxist and socialist theories. Marxism provides the theoretical foundation for the plan-ideological economy. As Castells (1992) notes, “a revolutionary state superimposes its belief and value system on society while at the same time it pursues a radical realignment of the social order” (p. 37). According to him, the revolutionary

state has a preconceived notion of what social relations should be and therefore attempts to rebuild society in accordance with this notion (often regardless of the economic consequences or without due respect to the international order). Yet, despite concerted state intervention in both East Asia and Latin America, it would be difficult to label any of these “revolutionary states” with the possible exception of Cuba. Vigorous competitive internal markets, international trade, and robust entrepreneurial corporations are all characteristics of these economies.

In the context of development, dependency theory contributes the most prominent and intriguing Marxist ideas. The basic version of dependency theory allocates most of the blame for Latin America’s underdevelopment to the unequal relationship between advanced and developing countries in the international economy as developed in the terms of trade thesis by Prebisch (1962). A more sophisticated analysis of dependency emerged out of the thought of Cardoso (with Faletto, 1979) and Evans (1979). Discarded was the simplistic notion that underdevelopment was solely the result of outside forces and thus the only alternative to this system is de-linkage from global markets and revolution. While recognizing that external factors shape and constrain economic growth, they argued that development was possible on the periphery, albeit of a distorted nature. They called it “dependent development” and it was characterized by the close political and economic ties among international capital represented by multinational corporations, local capital and the elite, and finally the state. According to *dependistas*, this alliance was at the root of underdevelopment in Latin America.

Dependency theory, however, has not been able to explain East Asia’s rapid growth, notwithstanding its significant connections with the outside world. International trade and investment have been pivotal for its economic expansion. In the case of Korea, international capital has been the cornerstone of growth. In Taiwan, multinational corporations have played an important role in its development, too. Thomas Gold (1986) in his analysis of Taiwan comes close to explaining East Asian development within a dependency framework. He believes that dependency can be superseded by producing positive outcomes in the form of capital accumulation, growth, and redistribution. However, an argument suggesting that international finance was the primary factor of East Asia’s *success* is an odd one to make from a Marxist perspective. It is also a difficult one to formulate given the state’s preponderant role in development in this region. Only Evans’ (1979) unique framework of focusing on the balance of class forces within society and their relationship with the state and, in turn, examining how that outcome affected the state’s relations with international capital has had traction. Evans argued that the existing domestic class structure within which international trade and finance take place is critical in determining the social and economic results within a country. Nevertheless, as a *dependista*, his thesis remained firmly in the camp of emphasizing external factors over domestic criteria for explaining development outcomes.

Developmental state theory takes Evans argument one step further in that it not only agrees that state society relations within a country are important but in fact deems them to be the most dominant factor affecting social and economic outcomes. Not surprisingly, Evans (1989; 1995) has become one of the most prominent advocates of the developmental state theory. Developmental state theory is at the

center of the plan-rational political economy as it recognizes the robust role of government intervention in society and markets. It goes much beyond providing a legal framework as asserted in the institutionalist framework. Indeed, it is the central actor in implementing a general transformation of the economy that will in turn strengthen the nation's position vis-à-vis international pressures. In Castells words,

A state is developmental when it establishes as its principle of legitimacy its ability to promote and sustain development, understanding by development the combination of steady high rates of economic growth and structural change in the productive system, both domestically and in its relationship to the international economy (1992, p. 36).

Castells also believes state-society relations are important in molding the type of state that emerges from their interaction. He asserts that the state must subordinate social interests, including those of the capitalist class and labor, to the interests of the nation. The following section explores in depth the origins of the concept and its main characteristics.

The Origins of the Theory and Substance of the Developmental State

Throughout economic history, there has been reference to a robust role of the state in economic and social affairs. The earliest writings were meant as a critique of classical and neoclassical works that asserted that industrialization for the early developers was a “market-driven and spontaneous affair” (Vartiainen, 1999, p. 202) despite empirical evidence to the contrary. For late-developers, these critiques are even more relevant. Fredrich List, Max Weber, and Alexander Gerschenkron all offer insights into the necessity of state action to instigate growth. List's writings are the most referred to by those advocating for a state-centered economic strategy. He is the author of the infant industry argument which argues for industrial protection via tariffs for late-developers. Without protection, it is unlikely that a nascent industry in one nation could become competitive with the same mature industry elsewhere. Helleiner (2021) also points to the influence of Henry Carey, List's contemporary, who made a similar case but also emphasized the importance of the formation of class coalitions in support of protectionist policies and for overcoming inequality and imperialism.

Weber is associated with developmental state theory for his writings on bureaucracy. He noted the rationality and efficiency bureaucrats could exert on policy-making which in turn is the hallmark of the developmental state. The presence of bureaucratic rational decision-making is based on two important assumptions both of which are satisfied in the case of the East Asian state. First, the bureaucracy must be staffed by competent and knowledgeable people based on a standardized meritocratic entrance system. Japan, South Korea, and Taiwan are all well known for their extremely competitive exam and interview system to enter government. Second, state generated policy does not solely reflect the competition of outside interests as liberal pluralists would argue. Nor does policy only resemble the whims of the capitalist class (i.e., the state is the “executive committee of the bourgeoisie”

argument) as claimed by Marxists. In fact, the state must have its own interests driven by the belief of bureaucrats that corporate and collective gain will enhance their own personal well-being or by a sense of nationalistic pride coupled with satisfactory monetary (i.e., market-based salaries) and professional benefits. Either way (or both), as Cardoso observes (quoted in Evans and Rueschmeyer, 1985), “one cannot see the state just as the expression of class interests, without recognizing that such an expression requires an organization which, since it cannot be other than a social network of people that exists in its own right and possesses interests of its own” (p. 47). It is readily apparent in East Asia that the state had its own interests separate from society.

Gerschenkron’s contribution to developmental state theory is his argument for the necessity of the state marshaling sufficient resources to initiate a full-fledged strategy of development. In the early stages of growth, private markets do not have the financial capital to commence large scale investment in frontier technologies. Thus, it is the goal of the state to amass such resources in a coordinated fashion. Gerschenkron’s notion of active state policy in capital accumulation and allocation goes well beyond the Weberian (and institutionalist) perspective of the state providing a suitable framework for the markets. In Evan’s words:

The crux of the problem faced by late developers is that institutions allowing large risks to be spread across a wide network of capital holders do not exist, and individual capitalists are neither able nor interested in taking them on. Under these circumstances the state must serve as surrogate entrepreneur (1989, p. 568).

With List, Weber, Gerschenkron, and many others (see Vartiainen, 1999) laying the groundwork for developmental state theory, it is not until the economic success of some East Asian nations from the 1960’s onwards that social scientists observe empirical cases of late-industrialization that do not conform to classical or neoclassical theory. Before examining developmental state theory in detail, it may be helpful to identify what these economic success stories in terms of theory were not. In doing so, some of the main differences in the composition and role of the state in the two regions under examination here should become apparent.

At the outset of their development trajectory, East Asian nations were under repressive regimes not unlike their Latin American counterparts. Guillermo O’Donell labeled the Latin American countries as bureaucratic authoritarian regimes. Collier (2001) defined this regime type as a form of: “bureaucratic and technocratic military rule that seeks to curtail popular mobilization and is built on a coalition and a policy orientation that entails strong ties to international economic actors” (p. 94). While superficially resembling the regimes in East Asia, this definition in fact conforms more to Evans’ theory of dependency. As discussed above, Evans asserted that the alliance of the local elite and the state with international capital was the determining factor of economic and social outcomes. This is a theory that may have some validity in Latin America but is certainly not applicable to East Asia as will be argued below.

Nevertheless, there were attempts at equating the two regional regime types as bureaucratic authoritarian, most notably by Cumings (1989). Cumings’ study of the political similarities of the state and society in Latin America and East Asia is

enlightening yet he fails to inject economic analysis into it.¹ He is correct to suggest that regimes in both regions were equally repressive and exclusivist and perhaps the Korean regime was more so from time to time than its Latin American counterparts in the 1970s. Yet, states in East Asia have relied on their ability to stimulate economic development as the main redeeming quality of their regime and thereby achieve some legitimacy in the eyes of citizens. To be sure, force was used to silence opposition to some policies. As Hsu (2012) affirms, “the East Asian developmental states had rapidly rising living standards and relatively equal income distribution... [and] the fact that average wages have risen faster in Korea than in other [emerging economies]” (p. 23). These results lent moral authority and legitimacy to the regime which offset some of the negative sentiment from the occasional use of force.

The main characteristic of the developmental state is thus not its authoritarian nature, although this may be a component of it in order to enable other parts, but its ability to produce economic growth with equity. The question then becomes how is it able to generate these results? Hsu’s (2012) analysis provides two main paradigms or variants of developmental state theory. The first is a pragmatic version that derives itself from the theories of List and *Gerschenkron*. In order to foster late industrialization, the state must take an active role in marshaling national resources to initiate and then maintain high levels of economic growth. The pragmatic narrative involves a number of bureaucratic tools to prod and incentivize entrepreneurs and markets in a certain direction that generates fast speed growth. The second variant is the voluntarist paradigm. This perspective is embedded in history, nationalism, and solidarity (Hsu, 2012, p. 27). The security environment of Japan, South Korea, and Taiwan when they embarked on industrialization was precarious. They faced an external enemy that could invade, conquer, and occupy the nation. The challenge of rapid industrial transformation was in essence an existential one. The Cold War was in full force with tensions and security competition among adversaries at high levels. This threat of conflict and war fostered a sense of nationalism and solidarity especially among political leaders and the bureaucratic elite. The duty to perform well in both the private and public sectors permeated the mindset.

This paradigmatic parsing of developmental state theory is a good starting point for understanding the central components of a developmental state. However, more generally, the developmental state consists of these five elements. First and foremost, the autonomous nature of the state is the most salient characteristic. As Castells asserts (1992, p. 64), the political power of developing governments to impose and internalize their logic on their civil societies was a crucial feature in their ability to carry out their objectives. The absence of powerful domestic interest groups with the ability to impose their predilections enabled the state to perform rational analysis on issues and questions of economic importance. In sum, being free from the pressure of civil society groups, especially the capital-owning class, provided the space for the bureaucracy to operate in a cohesive, coherent, and effective manner. Furthermore, it also allowed for the state to act on behalf of the entire society ensuring

¹ To be fair, in later works, Cumings (1999) acknowledges the differences between the regions and labels the East Asian state as Bureaucratic Authoritarian Industrializing States (BAIS).

all benefited from the nation's economic success. Thus, the balance of class forces was such that the state was in a position of authority and strength over other classes and was not easily influenced by any of them. As Vartiainen (1999) points out, "A successful state must be able to formulate credible and consistent policies that do not change overnight. This is precisely what bold and insensitive bureaucracies are good at" (p. 220).

Second, it is commitment to property rights and a free-market framework that ensures loyalty and commitment from private economic actors. Vartiainen (1999, pp. 221-223) argues that all of the late successful industrializers adhered to the notion of a market-based economy with strong property rights and a legal system to support them. There was "no master plan" for a socialist economy. Indeed, there was always the assurance that state guidance would soften by lessening protection and by allowing private agents to eventually compete more directly. These assurances supported by actual sequential policy reassured the private markets of their return on investment. As an indicator of this commitment to market practices was the East Asian states' management of macro-economic policy.² All late industrializers conformed for the most part to classical economic theory on macroeconomic indicators. They pursued balanced budgets, low international debt ratios, low inflation, and low interest rates. Moreover, they were receptive to foreign investment and open to international trade. This market-based framework convinced the private sector to vigorously participate in the state's objective of national development for reasons of both private and collective profit-making.

Third, the notion of societal embeddedness, as famously formulated by Evans (1989; 1995), is an essential element of the developmental state. The fact that the state had the upper hand over civil society did not mean it wielded its knowledge and authority uncompromisingly with respect to the market. Rather, it sought a cooperative and inclusive relationship with private business. Evans affirms that embeddedness "implies a concrete set of connections that link the state intimately and aggressively to particular social groups [i.e., business] with whom the state shares a joint project of transformation" (p. 59). Indeed, Evans (1989) notes that Samuels' depiction of embeddedness strikes the correct balance in determining how the state creates development policy: rather than any innate capability of the state, it is the intricacy and consistency of the state's relationships with market participants that engender its efficacy (p. 574).

Fourth, as already discussed, a highly competent bureaucracy is a necessary condition for a successful developmental state. Johnson (1982) considers the employees of the Ministry of International Trade and Industry during the high growth years of the 1960's and 1970's to be "without doubt the greatest concentration of brainpower in Japan" (p. 26). The high failure rates to enter governmental agencies in Japan, South Korea, and Taiwan are indicative of the quality of the personnel in government. According to Evans (1989), in addition to the competent nature of the bureaucracy, informal networks among the personnel solidify the governmental brain trust. Many of them come from similar backgrounds and have studied at the same universities. There is a sense of trust and belonging among them that breeds

² See Krueger (1995).

information sharing, cooperation, and mutual support. It continues even after retirement as many ex-government officials are sent to work at corporations to act as a bridge between the public and private sectors. This all contributes to the coherence and effectiveness of the bureaucracy.³

Fifth, borrowing from List and Gerschenkron, Wade (1990) coined the term “Governing the Market” for the type of state intervention performed by late industrializers.⁴ Intervention can take the form of policies at both the industry-sector level and the company unit level. At the industry sector level, Wade describes these policies as “following the market.” *Followership* is when the government underwrites some of the bets that the private sector has already made or would be prepared to make on its own. For Wade, this type of intervention should not be alarming to classical and neoclassical economists as these are investments that the private sector was considering doing on its own. They consist of providing advice, information, and finance to companies in order to upgrade their business models either through new capital outlays (i.e., new equipment and machinery purchases) or new marketing and outreach techniques to access new clients. At the company level, Wade labels this type of intervention as “leading the market” or *leadership* and is typically known as “picking winners.” This type of intervention consists of investing directly in a company or establishing a state-owned company. This type of investment is made when the private sector would not on its own be willing or have the ability to make such a large financial commitment. The most famous example is the Korean government’s creation of POSCO, one of the largest steel makers in the world. In sum, Governing the Market policies are characterized by government economic policies that combine “a very high level of productive investment, more investment in certain key industries, and exposure of many industries to international competition” (Hsu, 2012, p. 21).

The establishment of developmental states in East Asia is in contrast to the state’s configuration in Latin America. Latin American states are more akin to what is known as predatory states with very small, limited pockets of efficiency and rationality. The penetration of capitalist classes into political leadership and bureaucracy has hamstrung and slowed efforts for industrial transformation. Moreover, this outcome has led to high levels of inequality and poverty in the region. Latin American states throughout the 20th century were governed by military regimes, oligarchic democratic states, or populist governments sometimes in the form of military regimes. However, the common dominator among them all was the infiltration of the state by an alliance between the landowning rural elite and the emerging capitalist-industrialists. On many occasions, they were one in the same (see Kaufman, 1990). These elites were sometimes joined by organized labor, especially in the cases of populist or oligarchic democratic governments, and by international

³ It should be made clear here that more recently these informal networks in bureaucracy are being heavily criticized. According to some, they are producing narrowmindedness, lack of creativity, cronyism and corruption. See, for example, “Dig up” (2023) and, for other related challenges facing the bureaucracy, see Glosserman (2023).

⁴ See also Amsden (1982). She uses the phrase “getting the prices wrong” for explaining South Korea’s state intervention.

capital. As Kaufman (1990) observes, the logical course of policy was for the continuation of the status quo as this was in the mutual interest of both the bureaucracy and their key elite constituencies. In his words, “In Latin America, where state elites were more vulnerable to cross-cutting sectoral and class pressures, incremental decisions were more likely to offset each other—or at least to limit the scope and degree of systemic change” (Kaufman, 1990, p. 133).

The state itself was staffed by non-committed individuals who sought to maximize personal, rather than collective, benefits. In the case of Brazil, as noted by Evans (1989), the bureaucracy depended on the personal protection of individual presidents. The top echelons of bureaucracy were appointed from outside based on political connections and usually had a term of only 4 or 5 years (the length of the presidency) which discouraged the gaining of expertise in their assigned fields and an ethos for long-term planning. Instead of relationships with the business sector becoming institutionalized, they became individualized for personal gain (Evans, 1989, p. 579). In sum, the weak state in Latin America meant that elite class interests could impose their will and vision on a bureaucracy that was incompetent at best and rent-seeking at worst.

On Establishing a Developmental State

Hsu’s analysis of the two paradigms that explain developmental state theory gives hints as to the creation of a developmental state. In this sense, these two paradigms should not be seen in opposition to each other as Hsu views them. They are in fact complementary. The voluntarist perspective borders on a cultural argument of *noblesse oblige* in which there is an ethic of empathy and responsibility inherent in the culture of these countries. While this may be true, if this ethic is not converted into institutional reforms via enforced norms and rules, it will not remain permanent. In East Asia, best practices were institutionalized. For example, the strict meritocratic selection and promotion system within the bureaucracy became the norm and was at the foundation of these countries’ development. Once the condition of best practices has been fulfilled, the pragmatic paradigm takes on prominence in understanding the developmental state. With the best and brightest staffing the bureaucracy and corporations, this increases the likelihood of competent policy output. As Hsu (2012) explains, “the pragmatic paradigm understands the developmental state as a corporate actor with certain structural characteristics, which formulates and implements particular economic policies to promote industrialization” (p. 17).

The analysis of Hsu is helpful in initiating a discussion of the necessary conditions for the establishment of a developmental state and responds to the question of *how* a state becomes developmental. However, it does not adequately answer *why* a state becomes developmental. In fairness, Hsu’s emphasis on history is certainly potent in giving clues to the answer to why for select countries in the region but the holy grail of a generic explanation is absent. If only a very specific moment in history – i.e., when they faced the external existential threat – was the catalyst to these countries becoming developmental states, then this explanation would not offer much hope or wisdom to other late-developing countries that wish to replicate the

experience. Furthermore, we have seen other countries outside the initial success stories of Japan, South Korea, Taiwan, Singapore, and Hong Kong experience high speed growth as a result of enlightened (i.e., developmental) state policies. The most significant of them are the cases of Malaysia and Chile. But first, it is necessary to recap the unique historical circumstances of the initial cases and dissect them for “generic lessons.”

The two most salient and unique historic events that led up to South Korea and Taiwan’s high-speed growth eras are: first, in both South Korea and Taiwan the state was able to subdue and subordinate the capitalist class in urban areas and large landlords in rural areas just prior to the start of industrialization (see Cheng, 1990; Kay, 2002). The establishment of state hegemony over society provided space and independence for bureaucratic officials to create and implement policy. Second, the external threat faced by both countries fostered a culture of nationalism and a sense of urgency to industrialize as an act of survival. Despite these being unique events associated directly with these countries, it is still possible to distill some general lessons. The following is a tentative theory or list of factors, including the two above in their generic form, that will foster a developmental state. It is not exhaustive, but rather to provoke a debate and further research on the topic.

The outcome of these two unique events demonstrates the exceptional importance of the balance of class forces, as has been reiterated throughout this article, being such that the state is hegemonic and can repel penetration from the undesirable influence of domestic interest groups. In the cases of Japan⁵, South Korea,⁶ and Taiwan⁷, this configuration of state and society was the consequence of an event of a “revolutionary” nature. In Japan, the Meiji Restoration in the 19th century substantially weakened the power of regional samurais who were previously the political and economic elite of the country. Then, defeat in World War II and American occupation completely revamped the balance of class forces with the state (and occupation forces) being given ample powers to impose its will over society. In South Korea, a similar far-reaching event led to almost identical results. The Japanese colonization of the Korean peninsula in the early 20th century debilitated, if not vanquished, the economic and social powers of the Korean elite. After the Korean War between the north and south, civil society was in chaos. Then, with the rise of dictatorship under Park Chung Hee, the state easily consolidated its power over society. In Taiwan, the defeat of the Kuomintang (KMT) in the civil war with the Communists on the continent in the mid-20th century led to the KMT’s retreat to Taiwan. The agricultural elites in Taiwan were already in a fragile state after 50 years of colonization by the Japanese and were in no position to challenge the KMT. The KMT quickly established itself as the leading political and military force on the island.

From the above discussion arises the question of whether a revolutionary-like event is a requisite for state autonomy. This is indeed almost impossible to answer but most cases of late successful development have undergone such an

⁵ For Japan, see Johnson (1982).

⁶ For South Korea, see Amsden (1989).

⁷ For Taiwan, see Wade (1990) and Gold (1986).

experience. China had a communist revolution. Chile had the Pinochet dictatorship which imposed its authority over its much weaker capitalist allies in society.⁸ The capitalist elites of Chile were certainly the junior partners in the ruling coalition which distinguishes the Pinochet regime from others in the region such as the one in Argentina. These latter type regimes were thoroughly penetrated by outside capitalist interests and their maintenance of political power depended on the support of these outside elite interests. In contrast to the Argentina experience, Malaysia, Indonesia, Thailand, and other successful emerging economies all have similar stories to that of Chile, Korea and Taiwan of one-party dominance or dictatorship that insulated bureaucracies from outside interference and permitted a rational planning process.

Notwithstanding this seemingly depressing conclusion, it is possible to envision the creation of state autonomy through a less violent or repressive dictatorial process. Some countries in Latin America, such as Colombia, Mexico, and Peru as well as India, South Africa, and Nigeria are recently experiencing acceptable levels of growth without having been subject to revolution or dictatorship. Although it could be argued that these countries have indeed suffered from violent social upheaval, it is important to note that they are pursuing a different political path through a quasi-democratic process. It is still far too early to know if they will reach the economic status of South Korea, Taiwan, or China. Yet, through fits and starts, they have achieved a modicum of success. Acemoglu and Robinson's (2019) concept of the Red Queen effect may help in explaining this success. The Red Queen effect is the pursuit of an equitable balance of power between state and society made possible by the organic mobilization of civil society to advance national interests, such as economic growth, that benefit all. As opposed to a top-down process of reform through revolution or dictatorship, the Red Queen effect is a bottom-up phenomenon where society pressures the state to behave in a non-predatory manner.

According to Acemoglu and Robinson, such a process is not a straightforward one and requires patience and perseverance at a country-level. It is achieved through society deploying institutional and non-institutional means to check the power of the government while leaving it in a sufficiently powerful position to conduct the business of the state. The institutional tools for keeping the state from becoming too powerful or dictatorial are elections, constitutions, and courts. This means the state must have already given birth to at least rudimentary forms of democracy or be on the verge of doing so. The non-institutional tools consist of mass mobilizations such as protests, strikes, and civil disobedience movements if necessary. There is no doubt that such a process to develop strong institutions via the Red Queen effect takes a much longer timeframe – decades if not centuries – but it is the path that many western democracies took to achieve state autonomy.

The second factor, a strong sense of nationalism that was a consequence of an external threat in the original successful cases of late development, is somewhat easier to foster than the “revolutionary event” factor discussed above. Patriotism and nationalism are present within all political entities. Nations can rally around achievements in culture, history, society, and sports. Appropriate means of communicating and instilling patriotism among citizens to focus single-mindedly on

⁸ See Edwards (2023).

economic and social development should not be an insolvable challenge.

At a secondary level, there are two factors that will impinge on the emergence of an *effective* autonomous state, i.e., the bureaucracy's ability to implement rational policy. The first factor is large investments in human resources to buttress the cache size of appropriately skilled labor employable in government and in economy-wide industry. Without a sufficient supply of adequately educated labor, it is unlikely the state will be able to deploy the necessary bureaucratic brain trust to manage the economy. Even if this were possible, the economy at large would be handcuffed because of the insufficient supply of educated labor to fill industry positions and thereby retarding growth. There is now ample empirical evidence supporting the earlier economic theoretical models that suggested significant returns on investments in human capital. On these models, Vartiainen (1999) points out that "in general, these models lead to the conclusion that an economy's growth performance can be enhanced by various interventions, such as subsidies to investment in sectors with high potential for spillovers or subsidies to education and research" (p. 206).⁹ Evans and Heller (2015) cite a wealth of studies that offer empirical evidence that supports these models. From research in Central American coffee producers to Scandinavian states, the main conclusion is that the relationship between capability expansion (i.e., educational investments) and economic growth is very strong.¹⁰

Second, a rational decision-making process is indispensable in formulating an appropriate policy response to solve intractable economic challenges. Many of the successful solutions to economic bottlenecks facing developing countries in the past were not obvious *a priori*. On numerous occasions, problems such as the recurring balance of payments (BOP) crises were solved by trial and error (see Cheng, 1989). Both East Asia and Latin America faced these same challenges and often initially managed them in a similar manner but then later diverged significantly once the initial policy ended in failure. In the case of the BOP crises, East Asia, after pursuing import substitution for numerous years, opted to increase exports in order to solve for dollar scarcity. In contrast, Latin America chose to stay on the path of more import substitution which, as well known now, created more dollar shortages. The ability of East Asian nations to chart new, enlightened paths is a consequence of knowledgeable individuals working within a shielded environment.

Conclusion

Critical to understanding the development strategies in each region are the roles their states played in instigating and implementing economic policy. As a result of embedded autonomy, the East Asian states had much wider scope to execute their

⁹ Vartiainen (1999) cites Azariadis & Drazen (1991) in which they ascertain the strong contribution of educational expenditures for economic growth and the existence of growth "thresholds."

¹⁰ Evans and Heller (2015) cite Booser, et al. (2003) among others.

development programs. In contrast, the Latin American state suffered from deep penetration by civil society especially the elite capitalist owning classes. This often had the effect of corrupting development policy to favor a few over the rest of society. In East Asia, the balance of class forces gave the state the upper hand and permitted it to emerge as hegemonic over society. This was not the case in Latin America where the state essentially became captured by outside interests. The configuration of social forces permitted the state in East Asia to coordinate local industrialists, international capital, and society at large in a national effort towards economic transformation. In so doing, it was able to shape, and not be shaped by, the international environment. The opposite was true in Latin America. An alliance of local industrialists, labor, and the state, often with the support and assistance of transnational capital, led the way towards a regrettable strategy of slow growth, inequality, and widespread poverty.

Developmental state theory offers the best explanation of these outcomes. The plan-rational political economy of the East Asian nations in which the state intervenes to correct for market failures through direct and indirect investments in industry is a crucial framework for understanding the region's success. It goes much beyond institutionalism which contends that only a legal framework for the market suffices. The lack of a plan-rational political economy, by contrast, can explain Latin America's mediocre results. Furthermore, the empirical evidence of significant state intervention would contradict the arguments of neoclassical economic theory in explaining the economic achievements of East Asia. It is abundantly clear that the invisible hand of the market had substantial help from the state in East Asia. Dependency theory also fails to provide a satisfactory explanation. The results in East Asia are indicative of the preeminence of internal factors over external factors as the state was able to impose its will over both domestic civil society *and* transnational capital. Even in Latin America, where it is assumed dependency theory fits best, policies formulated domestically created international dependency – not the other way around. Dollar shortages as a result of the import substitution economic model fostered dependency on international capital.

As outlined here, the developmental state is characterized by its insulation from outside pressures; commitment to a market-based economy; its ability to interact with civil society especially the capitalist classes to both offer advice and prod them in profitable directions; intervention in the economy to promote national development; and finally, being staffed with a highly competent bureaucracy. However, describing the developmental state is only a first step in unlocking the path to economic transformation. Understanding the factors leading to the creation of a developmental state is essential to achieving high-speed growth. It is argued here that a reconfiguration of class forces, either through a revolutionary event or a slower democratic path underpinned by a mobilized civil society, is a necessary condition for the emergence of strong public institutions.

The autonomous nature of the state staffed by highly talented personnel allowed East Asia to use a rational, long-term approach to tackle issues of development. Moreover, once in place, these policies created networks of interest to sustain and advance the strategy which then bred further success. This only increased the legitimacy of, and support for, the state. It also meant the state could rely less on the use of force and more on its moral authority to implement policy even when

policy was viewed unfavorably by the public. The resulting high-speed growth meant that this region could not only shield itself from detrimental external interests but also use these interests to its advantage.

References

- Acemoglu, D., & Robinson, J. A. (2019). *The narrow corridor: How nations struggle for liberty*. Penguin UK.
- Amsden, A. (1989). *Asia's next giant: South Korea and late industrialization*. Oxford University Press.
- Azariadis, C. & Drazen, A. (1990). Threshold externalities in economic development, *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 105 (2), 501-526.
- Boozer, M., Ranis, G., Stewart, F., and Suri, T. (2003). *Paths To success: The relationship between human development and economic growth*. Discussion Paper No. 874 Economic Growth Center Yale University among many other studies.
- Cardoso, F. H., & Faletto, E. (1979). *Dependency and development in Latin America*. University of California Press.
- Castells, M. (1992). Four Asian tigers with a dragon head: Comparative analysis of the state, economy, and society in the Asian Pacific Rim. In J. Henderson, & R.P. Appelbaum (Eds.), *States and development in the Asian Pacific Rim* (pp. 33 -70). Sage Publications.
- Cheng, T. J. (1990). Political regimes and development strategies: South Korea and Taiwan. In G. Gereffi & D.L. Wyman (Eds.), *Manufacturing miracles: Paths of industrialization in Latin America and East Asia* (pp.138-178). Princeton University Press.
- Collier, D. (2001). Bureaucratic authoritarianism. In J. Krieger (Ed.), *The Oxford companion to politics of the world* (pp. 93-95). Oxford University Press.
- Cumings, B. (1989). The abortive abertura: South Korea in the light of Latin American experience. *New Left Review*, 173 (January–February), 5-33.
- Cumings, B. (1999). Webs with no spiders, spiders with no webs: The genealogy of the developmental state. In M. Woo-Cumings (Ed.), *The developmental state* (pp. 61-92). Cornell University Press.
- Dig up all of the amakudari dirt. (2017 Feb. 23). *Japan Times*, <https://www.japantimes.co.jp/opinion/2017/02/23/editorials/dig-amakudari-dirt/>
- Edwards, S. (2023). *The Chile project: The story of the Chicago boys and the downfall of neoliberalism*. Princeton University Press.
- Evans, P. B. (1979). *Dependent development: The alliance of multinational, state, and local capital in Brazil*. Princeton University Press.
- Evans, P.B. (1989). Predatory, developmental, and other apparatuses: A comparative political economy perspective on the Third World. *Sociological Forum* 4 (4), 561-587.
- Evans, P.B. (1995). *Embedded autonomy: States and industrial transformation*. Princeton University Press.
- Evans, P. B. & Heller, P. (2015). Human development, state transformation, and the politics of the developmental state. In S. Leibfried et al. (eds), *The Oxford handbook of transformations of the state - online*. Oxford Academic.
- Evans, P. B. & Rueschemeyer, D. (1985) The state and economic transformation: Towards an analysis of the conditions underlying effective intervention. In P.B. Evans, D. Rueschemeyer & T. Skocpol, (Eds.). *Bringing the state back in* (pp. 44-77). Cambridge University Press.
- Glosserman, B. (2023 August 8). Japan's young civil servants are growing disillusioned. *Japan Times*, <https://www.japantimes.co.jp/commentary/2023/08/08/japan/japan-young->

- bureaucrats/"<https://www.japantimes.co.jp/commentary/2023/08/08/japan/japan-young-bureaucrats/>
- Gold, T. B. (1986). *State and society in the Taiwan miracle*. Routledge.
- Helleiner, E. (2021). *The Neomercantilists: A Global Intellectual History*. Cornell University Press.
- Henderson, J. & Appelbaum, R.P. (1992). Situating the state in the East Asian development Process. In J. Henderson, & R.P. Appelbaum (Eds.), *States and development in the Asian Pacific Rim* (pp. 1 -26). Sage Publications.
- Hsu, K. (2012). Two paradigms of the developmental state approach, with special reference to South Korea and Taiwan. *American Journal of Chinese Studies* 19 (1), 3-28.
- Johnson, C. (1982). *MITI and the Japanese miracle: The growth of industrial policy, 1925-1975*. Stanford University Press.
- Kaufman, R. R. (1990). How societies change developmental models or keep them: reflections on the Latin American experience in the 1930s and the postwar world. In G. Gereffi & D.L. Wyman (Eds.), *Manufacturing miracles: Paths of industrialization in Latin America and East Asia* (pp. 110-138). Princeton University Press.
- Kay, C. (2002). Why East Asia overtook Latin America: agrarian reform, industrialization and development. *Third World Quarterly*, 23 (6), 1073-1102.
- Krueger, A.O. (1995). East Asian experience and endogenous growth theory. In T. Ito & A. O. Krueger (Eds.), *Growth theories in light of the East Asian experience* (pp. 9-36). University of Chicago Press.
- Lal, D. (1983). *The poverty of development economics*. Institute of Economic Affairs, London.
- Muro, M. (2023, March 6). *Biden's big bet on place-based industrial policy*. Brookings. <https://www.brookings.edu/articles/bidens-big-bet-on-place-based-industrial-policy/>"<https://www.brookings.edu/articles/bidens-big-bet-on-place-based-industrial-policy/>
- Prebisch, R. (1962). *The economic development of Latin America and its principal problems*. CEPAL Bulletin.
- Rodrik, D. (2022, April 11). *Development economics goes north*. Project Syndicate. <https://www.project-syndicate.org/commentary/rich-countries-with-developing-country-problems-by-dani-rodrik-2022-04?barrier=accesspaylog>"<https://www.project-syndicate.org/commentary/rich-countries-with-developing-country-problems-by-dani-rodrik-2022-04?barrier=accesspaylog>
- Vartiainen, J. (1999). The economics of successful state intervention in industrial transformation. In M. Woo-Cummings (Ed.), *The developmental state* (pp. 200-234). Cornell University Press.
- Wade, R. (1990). *Governing the market: Economic theory and the role of government in East Asian industrialization*. Princeton University Press.
- Wade, R. (2018). The developmental state: Dead or alive. *Development and Change* 49 (2), 518-546.
- Williamson, J. (1993). Democracy and the "Washington consensus". *World Development*, 21(8), 1329-1336.
- Williamson, J. (2004). The Washington Consensus as policy prescription for development. In T. Besley & R. Zaghera (Eds.), *Development challenges in the 1990s: Leading policymakers speak from experience* (pp. 31-53). Oxford University Press.
- World Bank. (1993). *The East Asian miracle: Economic growth and public policy*. Washington, DC: Policy Research Department, The World Bank.

Leo Strauss's Theory of Tyranny: Ancient and Modern

Reimon Sakai *

ABSTRACT: In this article, I deal with the theory of tyranny by Leo Strauss (1899-1973), the German-American scholar who was one of the leading political philosophers of the 20th century. His disciples are called the Straussians, and they are influential not only in America but all over the world. Through a close reading of *On Tyranny*, I would like to examine the modes of existence of tyranny through the discussions of Xenophon, Strauss and Kojève that tried to determine the essence of tyranny. After clarifying the forms of tyranny both in ancient and in modern times, I would like to consider whether Strauss's arguments are still valid in light of the problems of science and technology.

KEYWORDS: Strauss, Kojève, tyranny, science, technology

Introduction

In this article, I discuss the theory of tyranny by Leo Strauss (1899-1973), one of the leading political philosophers of the 20th century. Strauss was born and raised in a Jewish family near Marburg, Germany, and studied at universities in Hamburg and Freiburg. He subsequently pursued Jewish studies in Berlin. In 1938, he fled to the United States due to the rise of the Nazi regime. After becoming a professor at New York's New School for Social Research, he taught political philosophy at the University of Chicago.

Strauss is known for his numerous commentaries on the writings of classical political philosophers. Strauss's disciples are called the Straussians, and they are influential not only in America but worldwide. Some of his most notable disciples include philosophers such as Allan Bloom and Stanley Rosen.

Strauss is also known for arguing with Alexandre Kojève about a short work of the ancient Greek philosopher Xenophon, "Hiero or Tyrannicus," with a disproportionately long commentary. This work by Xenophon is structured as a dialogue between the tyrant Hiero and the wise Simonides. While Hiero expresses how painful it is to be a tyrant, Simonides refutes Hiero, emphasizing how blessed the tyrant is. Ultimately, Simonides proposes the way to be an ideal tyrant.

Strauss and Kojève's respective interpretations of the work of Xenophon, a contemporary of Plato and a disciple of Socrates, should be studied even today, not merely because Xenophon is less well-known than Plato, or because it is necessary

* Part-time Lecturer, Political Philosophy, Faculty of International Studies, Kindai University. E-mail: re_sakai@kindai.ac.jp

to clear up the misunderstandings that have arisen about Xenophon. Because of the significance of the issues addressed in Strauss's article on Xenophon's work "On Tyranny" (1948), Kojève's article "Tyranny and Wisdom" (1954), and Strauss's subsequent "Restatement on Xenophon's Hiero" (1954), as well as the Strauss-Kojève correspondence in the book "On Tyranny," their interpretations merit thorough examination.¹

"On Tyranny" has been extensively researched, mostly by those interested in Kojève and Strauss. It is not necessary to introduce all the results of these studies here, but a representative study is the book *Philosophy, History, and Tyranny* (2016, not yet translated into Japanese) that has been recently published in the United States.² In this book, ten scholars take up the debate between Kojève and Strauss from their own points of view, more than 60 years after the first publication of the edition of *On Tyranny* containing the treatises "Tyranny and Wisdom" and "Restatement." The publication of this book dealing with the theories developed in *On Tyranny* indicates that is a topic of interest to many researchers even today.

Brian-Paul Frost's article, "Who Won the Strauss-Kojève Debate?" is a noteworthy contribution to *Philosophy, History, and Tyranny*. Although Strauss had two opportunities to write his treatises and Kojève had only one, Frost argues that Kojève was far from losing the debate. In his article "Tyranny and Wisdom," Kojève argues that "It is history itself that attends to 'judging' (by 'achievement' or 'success') the deeds of statesmen or tyrants."³ Probably being aware of it, Frost affirms that "only Time (= History = Being = Truth) will tell" who will be the winner in the debate between Strauss and Kojève.⁴ Therefore, it is possible to consider that judgment on this point is entrusted to us, those who are alive today.

Moreover, Waller R. Newell's article "Kojève's Hegel, Hegel's Hegel, Strauss's Hegel" in the same volume also provides important insights. Newell deciphers the debate between Kojève and Strauss, considering the lack of a "middle range" in Strauss's argument that could exist between the dichotomy of wisdom and tyranny. According to Newell, Strauss thought that "the independence of the philosophical life is the only certain defense against tyranny."⁵ In my opinion, Newell has in mind the fact that while Strauss did not admit any middle ground between philosophical life—which probably means "wisdom"—and tyranny, Kojève argued that "intellectuals," a middle range, are needed to fulfill an important mission of mediation between wisdom and tyranny. Being himself a bureaucrat as well as an "intellectual," Kojève writes that "The philosopher is right to leave the responsibility for bringing about a convergence on the theoretical plane between his philosophical

¹ Cf. Alexandre Kojève, "Tyrannie et sagesse," in Leo Strauss, *De la tyrannie*, Gallimard, 1997, p. 149. ("Tyranny and Wisdom," in *On Tyranny*, edited by Victor Gourevitch and Michael S. Roth, University of Chicago Press, 2000, p. 135.) Kojève wrote this article originally in French.

² Edited by Timothy W. Burns and Bryan-Paul Frost, *Philosophy, History, and Tyranny*, State University of New York Press, 2016. As for other previous research on the Kojève-Strauss controversy, see my book *Atheism and the State* (Nakanishiya Publisher, 2017 in Japanese), pp. 17-9.

³ Kojève, "Tyrannie et sagesse," *De la tyrannie*, p. 199. ("Tyranny and Wisdom," *On Tyranny*, p. 176.)

⁴ Frost, "Who Won the Strauss-Kojève Debate?," *Philosophy, History, and Tyranny*, State University of New York Press, 2016, p. 195.

⁵ Waller R. Newell, "Kojève's Hegel, Hegel's Hegel, Strauss's Hegel," *Philosophy, History, and Tyranny*, p. 220.

ideas and political reality to a constellation of intellectuals of all shades (more or less spread out in time and space)."⁶

In this way, we can discover a wide variety of points of contention from *On Tyranny*, but what I would like to discuss in this article is the question of tyranny, especially in ancient and modern times. The discussions about tyranny developed by ancient philosophers may seem irrelevant to us, but as Strauss points out, "One cannot understand modern tyranny in its specific character before one has understood the elementary and in a sense natural form of tyranny which is premodern tyranny."

⁷ It will be meaningful to consider the modes of existence of tyranny in the modern world through the discussions by Xenophon, Strauss and Kojève that attempted to determine the essence of tyranny.

In the following sections, while relying on Strauss, I will first clarify what tyranny was in ancient times, then clarify secondly the form of tyranny seen in modern times, next connecting it subsequently to the problems of science and technology, and finally I would like to discuss whether his arguments are still valid today.

Tyranny in Ancient Times

The Notion of Tyranny

This section I delve into the notion of tyranny as construed by ancient Greek philosophers. My particular emphasis will be on Strauss's interpretations of the views held by Xenophon, Socrates, and Aristotle.

I would like to begin by clarifying the difference between monarchy and tyranny. Although Strauss does not mention Aristotle, in Book III, 7 of *Politics*, Aristotle defines tyranny as rule by one man in his own interest, contrasting it with monarchy as rule by one man for the common good (1279B).⁸

Strauss, however, argues that the process of becoming a ruler differs between a king and a tyrant. Strauss asserts that Xenophon did not only write about tyrants, but also described the life of the successful King Cyrus in *Cyropaedia*. Cyrus was the legitimate successor to the previous king, and Cyrus expanded his territory through marriage and just conquests.⁹ Tyrants, on the other hand, typically seize power through military force, and this is what distinguishes tyrants from kings. Strauss's concept of a tyrant is unexceptional in that it is characterized by the absence of government legitimacy.

Interestingly, Strauss points out that Xenophon did not dare to erase the distinction between the best tyrant and the king, since Xenophon knew that legitimacy with legality would bring benefits. Expanding on Strauss's argument, we can deduce that Xenophon would have considered that tyranny, at best, fell short of good monarchy. Influenced by Xenophon, Strauss reasons that William III, who was

⁶ Kojève, "Tyranny and Wisdom," p. 198. ("Tyrannie et sagesse," *De la tyrannie*, p. 198.)

⁷ Strauss, "On Tyranny," *On Tyranny*, p. 23.

⁸ Cf. Nathan Tarcov, "Preface to the Japanese Version," *Senshu seiji ni tsuite (On Tyranny)*, Book I, translated by Yoshihiko Ishizaki, Shozo Iijima and Kazuya Omote, Gendai Shicho Shinsha, 2006, p. 16.

⁹ Strauss, "Restatement on Xenophon's *Hiero*," *On Tyranny*, p. 182.

legitimate in terms of his family lineage and became king after the Glorious Revolution, was a better ruler over the English than Oliver Cromwell, who usurped control from Charles I and established a kind of tyranny that took on the appearance of a republic.¹⁰ Xenophon sees a tyranny as an inherently unstable regime.¹¹ Moreover, it is not only a tyranny that is unstable, but a monarchy may also be unstable in some circumstances. In fact, Cyrus laid down a good government, but after his death, his sons fought against each other, and the country fell into chaos. Therefore, it cannot be asserted that a monarchy per se is a solid system. Nevertheless, Xenophon must have thought that a monarchy was still a relatively stable and enduring system compared to a tyranny.

Inferring from Strauss's remarks on tyranny, we can argue that Xenophon's Socrates, unlike a king who rules by law over his subjects who are willing to obey, a tyrant is a ruler who forces his unwilling subjects to obey. Since the tyrant is not bound by law, tyranny is "monarchical rule without law"; accordingly, it is difficult for people other than the tyrant to be blessed with freedom under such a system of government.¹²

Caesarism

Is this discussion of ancient Greek tyranny useful to those living in later times? According to Strauss, Eric Voegelin, in his book review of *On Tyranny*¹³ criticized the ancient Greek philosophers' conception of tyranny as being narrow or not very useful because it did not consider later phenomena such as Caesarism.¹⁴ Since Voegelin does not mention Caesar or Caesarism in his book review, Strauss may have found it in another of Voegelin's writings, or perhaps heard about it directly from him, but what is important for us is not identifying the source, but understanding how Strauss perceived Caesarism.

The question of whether Caesar was a tyrant is subject to debate. In Strauss's opinion, "Voegelin emphasizes, there are tyrannical as well as royal Caesars."¹⁵ Caesar may have been an unjust usurper of rulership because he became a dictator by force of arms rather than by blood lineage, and he was a consul, i.e. he did not ascend to the throne. Therefore, strictly speaking, it may not be possible to state that he was a king, yet perhaps Strauss's interpretation of Voegelin's real intention is to point out that it is possible to conclude that Caesar was a good ruler.

Secondly, I would like to consider the signification of Caesarism. According to Strauss, in Voegelin's thought, "Caesarism emerges only after 'the final breakdown of the republican constitutional order'; hence Caesarism" means a

¹⁰ Ibid., p. 182.

¹¹ Ibid., p. 181.

¹² Strauss, "On Tyranny," *On Tyranny*, p. 69. It is a well-known fact that Plato advocated rule by philosophers, but both Kojève and Strauss acknowledged that the possibility of its realization was extremely low. Shadia Drury maintains that Strauss, who considered the rule not bound by law as tyranny, affirmed tyranny as rule by the wise. Cf. Drury, *The Political Ideas of Leo Strauss*, Palgrave Macmillan, 1988, p. 95.

¹³ Eric Voegelin, *The Review of Politics*, Vol. 11, No. 2, April 1949, pp. 241-4.

¹⁴ Strauss, "Restatement on Xenophon's *Hiero*," *On Tyranny*, p. 179.

¹⁵ Ibid., p. 179.

“postconstitutional rule.”¹⁶ Before Caesar, Rome had adopted a republic based on law, but Caesar overthrew this republic by becoming a monarch, and this is the reason why he was assassinated.

Strauss disagrees with Voegelin’s view and asserts that Caesarism was nonetheless a sub-concept of the “absolute monarchy” conceived by ancient philosophers.¹⁷ For this reason, the ancient philosophers’ debates over tyranny are useful for later generations. Absolute monarchy is thought to refer to rule by one good ruler, in contrast to tyranny. In this case, the question should be what constitutes a good ruler. When Strauss writes, “Is not the difference between good and bad the most fundamental of all practical or political distinctions?”¹⁸ he does not explicitly define what is good and what is bad. The distinction between governance by good rulers and governance by bad rulers can be rephrased as the distinction between Caesarism and tyranny, but Strauss admits that the distinction is “too subtle” and that “The true doctrine of the legitimacy of Caesarism is a dangerous doctrine.”¹⁹

The Good Ruler

What kind of individual does Strauss think that good rulers would be? To find out the answer, we need to review Xenophon’s description in “Hiero or Tyrannicus.” As I mentioned in the Introduction, at the end of “Hiero or Tyrannicus,” Simonides, the wise man, proposes to the tyrant Hiero that he become a good ruler. Interpreting Xenophon’s writings, including “Hiero or Tyrannicus,” Strauss argues that “a good ruler is necessarily beneficent,”²⁰ and goes on to rephrase himself writing, “beneficent tyranny or the rule of a tyrant who listens to the counsels of the wise.”²¹ But what does “beneficent” mean?

In answer to this question, I would like to quote here what Strauss says about Xenophon’s concept of justice.

The just man is a man who does not hurt anyone, but helps everyone who has dealings with him. To be just, in other words, simply means to be beneficent.²²

Therefore, a good ruler is a person who does the right thing in the sense that he gives alms to those around him, that is, he is a “beneficent” person. This idea of Strauss’s is based on the “Machiavellian” suggestion by Simonides in “Hiero or Tyrannicus” (on and after 9.1) that the tyrant should not punish the people but should award the meritorious persons by himself.²³ Other than “Hiero or Tyrannicus” as the basis of his argument, Strauss briefly lists in the notes some references from the writings of ancient Greek philosophers, however he does not offer any detailed explanations.²⁴

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 178.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 179.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 179.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 180.

²⁰ Strauss, “On Tyranny,” *On Tyranny*, p. 74.

²¹ *Ibid.*, p. 75.

²² *Ibid.*, p. 74.

²³ *Ibid.*, p. 70.

²⁴ *On Tyranny*, p. 120.

In one of Strauss's references, *The Apology of Socrates* (26), Plato writes that since Socrates had turned toward the direction in which he could do his greatest good deeds, Socrates asked the people for the reward he deserved for his deeds. In another reference, *Memorabilia* (Book I, Chapter 2, 7), Xenophon writes that Socrates stated that the greatest persons of merit should be owed the greatest gratitude. From these facts, it can be said that Plato, Socrates, and Xenophon think that good deeds should be rewarded in the form of prizes and gratitude.

Let us bring the discussion back to Strauss. Justice transcends the lawful and the unlawful: it is supralegal. Strauss even admits that "rule without laws may very well be just ... in so far as the good ruler is 'a seeing law,' and laws do not 'see,' or legal justice is blind."²⁵ Law itself is not a person and, therefore cannot "see," whereas a good ruler can "see" those around him. If the person himself or herself is just willing to do so, it is possible to realize "the justice in business dealings—Aristotle's commutative justice proper" by appropriately giving benefits according to people's achievements.²⁶

Then, what kind of tyranny did Xenophon think should be practiced? In Chapter 9 of "Hiero or Tyrannicus," Simonides states that trust between a ruler and his citizens is established by the ruler through praising and honoring those who do the best things. In Chapter 10, Simonides states that the citizens willingly pay to hire mercenaries if the ruler, rather than hiring the mercenaries just for himself, hires them to protect all his citizens, which allows each citizen to focus on building his or her personal fortune. In Chapter 11, the last chapter, Simonides insists that the ruler should spend money for "the common good" for his citizens, instead of constructing his own "house embellished at tremendous cost."²⁷ By doing so, everyone in the ruler's vicinity becomes his allies, and the ruler can safely travel anywhere. Simonides adds that this would eventually lead to the ruler sharing the property of his allies. In these last three chapters, Hiero speaks little, remaining completely silent at the end of the treatise. Xenophon concludes by writing, "the polite silence in which a Greek tyrant, old in crime and martial glory, could listen to a siren-song of virtue." Strauss interprets the meaning of this silence as implying Hiero's agreement with Simonides.²⁸

Based upon what is developed in the above paragraphs, Simonides's use of the expression "ruler" instead of "tyrant" in the last three chapters of "Hiero or Tyrannicus" indicates that Xenophon did not regard tyranny as the best of all political systems. That is why Strauss claims that Xenophon "seems to have thought that tyranny at its best could hardly, if ever, be realized."²⁹

²⁵ Strauss, "On Tyranny," *On Tyranny*, p. 74.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 74.

²⁷ Xenophon, "Hiero or Tyrannicus," *On Tyranny*, p. 19.

²⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 64. Readers certainly may have to wonder whether Hiero was completely persuaded, as Strauss himself implies in the note to this sentence. Cf. *On Tyranny*, p. 118.

²⁹ Strauss, "On Tyranny," *On Tyranny*, p. 75.

Tyranny in Modern Times

Possibility of Establishing the Ideal Tyranny

In contrast to Xenophon, what is Strauss's opinion in regard to the possibility of good tyranny? Strauss contends that "Good tyranny is a utopia," in other words it is something extremely difficult to realize. Furthermore, he states, "We never denied that good tyranny is possible under very favorable circumstances."³⁰ Although Strauss does not give an explanation here as to under what circumstances it is possible to practice good tyranny, if the tyrant successfully carries out Simonides's proposals mentioned above, good tyranny can be thought to have been realized.

Kojève disagrees with this view by Strauss, however, he does not argue that the realization of a good tyranny was simple in antiquity. In his article "Tyranny and Wisdom," Kojève points out that in modern times it has become an almost banal phenomenon, in contrast to the fact that the "'ideal' tyranny sketched by Simonides" in the last three chapters of the article "Hiero or Tyrannicus," was "only a utopia" in ancient times.³¹ Kojève offers three reasons for this proposition. Firstly, a good tyrant must reward the people (Chapter 9 of "Hiero or Tyrannicus"). For example, in the Soviet Union, rewards were given to those who contributed to the movement to increase labor productivity called the "Stakhanovite" emulation. Secondly, the tyrant should organize a national police force and a standing army (Chapter 10). This was practiced not only in democratic countries, but also in countries ruled by tyrants when Kojève wrote his article. Thirdly, if the tyrant builds public facilities instead of his own mansion, his subjects will like him (Chapter 11). Building public facilities was nothing new even at the time when Kojève was alive.

In response to this objection, Strauss quotes Kojève's reference to the example of the Soviet Union, accusing Kojève of believing Stalin to be the ideal modern tyrant. In addition, Strauss ridicules Kojève's desire to claim that Stalin was free to travel anywhere outside the Iron Curtain, and that all those who lived behind the Iron Curtain were Stalin's allies.³² Prior to the publication of the edition of *On Tyranny* containing his article "Tyranny and Wisdom," Kojève had asked Strauss to modify or delete the paragraph including the above statement: "Kojève denies (...) (*Hiero* 11, 11 and 11, 14)" (a letter from Kojève to Strauss on September 19, 1950).³³ However, after closely examining the "Restatement," in comparison to the letter from Strauss to Kojève on September 28, 1950, I believe that it can be inferred that Strauss did not completely accept Kojève's request and only deleted the part containing Hitler from the previous paragraph, and published the book containing the part about Stalin.³⁴ Strauss's ridicule of Kojève is bitter, but it is not surprising that Stalin saw

³⁰ Ibid., p. 188.

³¹ Kojève, "Tyrannie et sagesse," *De la tyrannie*, p. 153. ("Tyranny and Wisdom," *On Tyranny*, p. 138.)

³² Strauss, "Restatement on Xenophon's *Hiero*," *On Tyranny*, p. 189.

³³ *On Tyranny*, p. 256. In fact, the quoted page reads "II, 11 and II, 14," but this is probably a typographical error that occurred when the editors transcribed it. Originally it must have been "11, 11 and 11, 14," since on page 189 where the content of the letter is written, it reads "11, 11 and 11, 14."

³⁴ Ibid., p. 257.

the citizens of the Eastern Bloc as his comrades and was able to travel safely within their circles. From our present point of view, it is difficult to imagine that Stalin really did good deeds. Yet, according to Kojève's niece Nina Kousnetzoff, Stalin's misdeeds were not known in France at the time, and it is likely that Kojève was unaware of them.³⁵

In the first place, it is not Stalin, but Salazar, the leader of Portugal, whom Kojève himself cites as an example of a good tyrant in modern times in "Tyranny and Wisdom." Just before mentioning Salazar, Kojève states that Xenophon "had not seen 'tyrannies' exercised in the service of truly revolutionary political, social, or economic ideas (that is to say, in the service of objectives differing radically from anything already in existence) with a national, racial, imperial, or humanitarian basis."³⁶ But Kojève does not claim that Salazar ruled based on these purposes and foundations. In Kojève's eyes, the good "tyranny" that Xenophon's Simonides thought was nothing more than a utopia has been realized by Salazar in modern times. It should be noted, however, that Kojève does not go so far as to praise Salazar unreservedly.

In response to Kojève's view, Strauss concedes in writing, "I am inclined to believe that Kojève is right, except that I am not quite certain whether Salazar's rule should not be called 'postconstitutional' rather than tyrannical."³⁷ As can be seen from Strauss's avoidance of making an assertion, Salazar could not be called a tyrant because he enacted a constitution, and it is possible to conceive that Salazar obtained power legally rather than unjustly usurping it. Thus, according to Strauss's definition of a tyrant, Salazar may have been a good *leader*, but he was not a good *tyrant*. Unlike Strauss, it may be presumed that Kojève defines a tyrant simply as a leader who has seized power, and that is probably why there was disagreement between Strauss and Kojève. It seems, therefore, that both Kojève and Strauss saw Salazar as a good leader to some extent.

Science and Nature

But the question of whether there were any good leaders in the contemporary age is less important for us than the question of what Strauss conceives of modern tyranny being like. He believes that modern tyranny is based not only on the popularization or spread of philosophical or scientific knowledge, but also on the infinite progress of modern science in its quest to "conquer nature,"³⁸ and it seems that Strauss was more critical of the latter point. According to Strauss, in contrast to modern science, whose goal is to conquer nature, the classical philosophers knew "the possibility of a science that issues in the conquest of nature and the possibility of the popularization of philosophy or science, (...) but, the classics rejected them as 'unnatural,' i.e., as destructive of humanity."³⁹

Contemporary philosophers who have discussed technology combined with science include Lewis Mumford, José Ortega y Gasset, Jacques Ellul, Martin

³⁵ This is based on my interviews with Kousnetzoff from 2010 to 2011 in Paris, France.

³⁶ Kojève, "Tyranie et sagesse," *De la tyrannie*, p. 154. ("Tyranny and Wisdom," *On Tyranny*, p. 138.)

³⁷ Strauss, "Restatement on Xenophon's *Hiero*," *On Tyranny*, p. 189.

³⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 178.

³⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 178.

Heidegger, and Hannah Arendt. Since they all were critical of technology, it is likely that amid such a trend that Strauss focused his attention on the issue of the destruction of humanity by science linked to tyranny. Before examining this point by Strauss, I would like to introduce the view of technology held by Arendt, a contemporary and acquaintance of Strauss. In her opinion, the worldview of “the maker and fabricator,” namely, “homo faber” which is seen as a characteristic mentality in the modern era, is colored by “sovereignty” which considers that nature can be freely transformed so as to facilitate fabrication.⁴⁰ And such a worldview is based on “the principle of utility,” which “was found wanting and was superseded by the greatest happiness of the greatest number” formulated by Jeremy Bentham.⁴¹ Consequently, it ended up “with the triumphal victory of exchange value over use value, first introduced the principle of interchangeability, then relativization, and finally the devaluation, of all values.”⁴² We can interpret this as meaning that technology has finally brought about a kind of nihilism.

Nature

However, Strauss did not think that technology or science would bring about nihilism. Let us return to Strauss’s discussion of the “conquest of nature” by science and the destruction of humanity. For the time being, the question to be asked here is what nature and humanity are for Strauss. In *On Tyranny*, he does not elaborate on this point.⁴³ Hence, in referring to Strauss’s *Natural Rights and History* (1953) based on lectures given at the University of Chicago in October 1949, I would like to explore the answer to the question of what nature and humanity are for Strauss. These lectures and the publication of this book appeared between 1948, when the first edition of the book *On Tyranny* was published, which included his articles “Hiero or Tyrannicus” and “On Tyranny,” and 1954, when the French edition of the same book was published. The French version additionally included Kojève’s article “Tyranny and Wisdom” and Strauss’s “Restatement.”

Strauss thinks that nature was originally concealed by the authority’s decisions or, in his words, “authoritative decisions.”⁴⁴ What is authority in this context? Strauss states that “Authority as the right of human beings to be obeyed is essentially derivative from law, and law is originally nothing other than the way of life of the community.”⁴⁵ Strauss also points out that before the discovery of nature, different communities had different “ways” or “customs,”⁴⁶ which were decided by authority. Strauss gives concrete examples of ways such as menstruation for women, abstaining from alcohol for Muslims, and not eating pork for Jews.⁴⁷

⁴⁰ Arendt, *The Human Condition*, Second Edition, The University of Chicago Press, 2018, p. 305.

⁴¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 307-8.

⁴² *Ibid.*, p. 307.

⁴³ Often referring to the concept of nature in *The City and Man*, Strauss develops his theory, typically seen in his affirmation that since the idea that all “evils” should be eliminated “is against nature,” “The just city is then impossible,” and in his sentence that “The equality of the sexes and absolute communism are against nature.” Strauss, *The City and Man*, The University of Chicago Press, 1964, p. 127.

⁴⁴ Strauss, *Natural Right and History*, The University of Chicago Press, 1953, p. 91.

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 84.

⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 82.

⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 82-3.

But, after the discovery of nature, things changed completely: “the ‘customs’ of natural beings” came to be regarded as their nature, and “the ‘customs’ of different human tribes” as their “conventions.”⁴⁸ Using the previous examples, natural beings can be thought of as women, and various human groups, such as Muslims and Jews. Nature and convention correspond to the Greek words *physis* and *nomos*. Discovering nature is a work of philosophy, and Strauss specifies that philosophy was established separately from myth when nature was discovered in ancient Greece.⁴⁹ In order for the idea of “natural right” to emerge, authority must first be questioned: such natural right is different from the righteousness based on the ways and customs of predecessors.⁵⁰

In Strauss’s opinion, one cannot live without thinking about “the first things, i.e., the oldest things.”⁵¹ This can be interpreted as meaning that Strauss assumes nature to be the primary being, because he writes that “Nature is the ancestor of all ancestors or the mother of all ancestors.”⁵² In fact, the Hebrew word for “nature” does not exist in the Hebrew Bible, Strauss therefore states that the Old Testament “does not know ‘nature,’” and that “heaven and earth” which appear in the Bible are different from “nature.”⁵³ Strauss also aptly points out that artificial things (or “art” in his words) presupposes nature, but nature does not presuppose artificial things.⁵⁴ Thus, Strauss seems to have recognized nature as the origin of all things.

Human Nature

Next, I would like to discuss how Strauss perceived human nature. Rephrasing “humanity” as “human nature,” he states that “We must distinguish between those human desires and inclinations which are in accordance with human nature and therefore good for man, and those which are destructive of his nature or his humanity and therefore bad.”⁵⁵ Hence he argues that this kind of harmony with nature leads to a good life, that is, a good human life.

As some ancient philosophers held that “the good” was not essentially the same as “the pleasant,” and that “the good” was more fundamental than “the pleasant,” they were critical of hedonism.⁵⁶ Influenced by their views, Strauss goes on to state that “the life according to nature,” as opposed to the life aimed solely at the pursuit of pleasure, is the life of a “high-class person,” and that it is “the life of human excellence or virtue” or simply “the good life.”⁵⁷ And “by nature,” he points out, there is an inherently admirable life which concerns perfected human nobility, and that such a life is often not preoccupied with one’s own interests or calculations.⁵⁸

⁴⁸ Ibid., p. 90.

⁴⁹ Ibid., pp. 81-2.

⁵⁰ Ibid., p. 84.

⁵¹ Ibid., p. 91.

⁵² Ibid., p. 92.

⁵³ Ibid., p. 81.

⁵⁴ Ibid., p. 92.

⁵⁵ Ibid., p. 95. In the present day, we should avoid using “man” to generalize people. In his use of neutral masculine pronouns, Strauss does not have any intention to discriminate against women.

⁵⁶ Ibid., p. 127.

⁵⁷ Ibid., p. 127.

⁵⁸ Ibid., p. 128.

Then what is the actual content of Strauss's assumption of "human nature"? He declares that "Man is by nature a social being," without daring to mention Aristotle by name.⁵⁹ And unlike animals, humans have language, reason and intelligence.⁶⁰ By communicating through languages, humans are more social than animals, therefore Strauss writes "Humanity itself is sociality."⁶¹ Human sociability is not derived from the calculation of the pleasure obtained from it, but is based on the nature that humans have innately, and consequently, humans derive pleasure from interacting with others.⁶²

The human nature defined by Strauss also includes freedom. However, as we all know, humans are not completely free to behave towards others as they see fit.⁶³ In this way, the exercise of liberty must be accompanied by restraint. "Restraint is therefore as natural or as primeval as freedom,"⁶⁴ Strauss points out.

He believes that coercive restraint rather than voluntary restraint is necessary for such restraint to be effective in the majority of cases. Strauss assumes that most people cannot control their own bodies through persuasion from others. Surprisingly, Strauss declares:

Man is so built that he cannot achieve the perfection of humanity except by keeping down his lower impulses. He cannot rule his body by persuasion.

This fact alone shows that even despotic rule is not per se against nature.⁶⁵ He continues by arguing that "despotic rule" is not necessary only in limited cases, such as in those where people actively accept persuasion from others and thus governed, or in those where they have excellent understanding.

Problems of Democracy and Criticism of Open Society

But, as can be seen from the fact that Strauss wrote "even despotic rule" in the previous quotation, what he intends here does not seem to be a positive affirmation of despotic rule or tyranny. What he is apprehensive about is the corruption that results from the exercise of liberty without any constraint. In *The City and Man* (1964), commenting on Plato's *Republic*, Strauss points out that people who thoroughly enjoyed freedom under democracy would fall into corruption. Based on Socrates's view that the human soul and the State are in a parallel relationship, Strauss explains the characteristics of human beings under democracy as assumed by Socrates:

The democratic man comes to sight as the son of an oligarchic father, as the degenerate son of a wealthy father who is concerned with nothing but making money: the democratic man is a drone, the fat, soft, and prodigal playboy, the Lotus-eater [the one that is immersed in pleasure] who,

⁵⁹ Ibid., p. 129.

⁶⁰ Ibid., p. 127.

⁶¹ Ibid., p. 129.

⁶² Ibid., p. 129.

⁶³ Ibid., p. 129.

⁶⁴ Ibid., p. 130.

⁶⁵ Ibid., pp. 132-3.

assigning a kind of equality to equal and unequal things, lives one day in complete surrender to the lowest desires and the next day ascetically.⁶⁶

If such is the case, “the democratic man” is by no means villainous, but he is unable to distinguish between good and bad deeds and tends to be captivated by his own desire. According to Strauss’s interpretation of Socrates, under democracy many people cannot control their desires nor improve themselves.⁶⁷

This is not the only problem with democracy. Although not mentioned by Strauss, Socrates said that the people under democracy tend to elect one person to be their leader; accordingly, whenever a tyrant is born, the tyrant is rooted in such a popular leader (*Republic*, 565D). In this way, Socrates recognized that democracy tended to easily turn into tyranny.

In addition, Strauss thinks that not only democracy, but also an open society dehumanizes people. In his opinion, although the open society encompasses several societies composed of various levels of political maturity, the society in which a human being can perfect his or her nature is necessarily a closed society.⁶⁸ Strauss prefers “a closed and relatively small society” to “a very large city,” because in the latter each person can live according to his own desires, but the range in which humans can exercise positive consideration is limited. He cites “Babylon” as an example of such a very large city.⁶⁹ Since he placed double quotations around “Babylon,” this term is interpreted to be used in a symbolic sense of “any rich and magnificent city believed to be a place of excessive luxury and wickedness,” rather than simply “the chief city of ancient Mesopotamia.” We can surmise that the closed societies which he envisaged include a group of philosophers who have communicated truth among themselves, using the esoteric art of writing and taking the form of oral tradition, so as not to be seen as dangerous by outsiders. Since Strauss also argues that “The distinction of the human race into a number of independent groups is according to nature,”⁷⁰ the closed societies which he supposes do not necessarily refer to depopulated areas, and it cannot be said that Strauss rejected the large framework of the nation-state.

Furthermore, in as much as it was Kojève who envisioned the arrival of the Universal and Homogenous State, it can be assumed that Strauss’s criticism of the open society was also directed at Kojève. Yet, it is inconceivable that Kojève would agree with equating the open society with the Universal and Homogenous State. Although Kojève does not desire the emergence of a tyrant ruling the Universal and Homogenous State, Strauss is concerned about the emergence of “the Universal and Final Tyrant,” the one who will rule the world for a long time and prevent free activities in closed societies: Strauss hereby particularly bears philosophical research

⁶⁶ Strauss, *The City and Man*, pp. 132-3. Notice that [...] is added by me.

⁶⁷ Although not mentioned by Strauss, Socrates said that the people under democracy tend to elect one person to be their leader; accordingly, whenever a tyrant is born, the tyrant is rooted in such a popular leader (*Republic*, 565D). In this way, Socrates recognized that democracy tended to easily turn into tyranny.

⁶⁸ Strauss, *Natural Right and History*, pp. 131-2.

⁶⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 131.

⁷⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 132.

in mind.⁷¹

Conclusion

In this paper, I have explored Leo Strauss's nuanced discussion on the nature and evolution of tyranny, juxtaposing ancient conceptions with modern realities. How should we grasp the arguments developed in this text?

First, in considering ancient tyranny, Strauss's reading of Xenophon's "Hiero or Tyrannicus" leads him to the conclusion that it was "monarchical rule without law," and that beneficent tyranny was permissible for the ancient philosopher. Democracy led by politicians who are not beneficent is not much different from a political system ruled by an evil tyrant. Xenophon held that the beneficent tyrant should reward persons of merit and build institutions for the common people instead of constructing palaces for himself. According to Kojève, to expect such things from tyrants in antiquity was nothing more than a fantasy, but modern rulers ordinarily practice such policies. Whereas Kojève regarded Salazar as a good tyrant that Simonides of Xenophon in "Hiero or Tyrannicus" assumed was impossible, Strauss acknowledged the possibility that Salazar was a good ruler, although probably not a tyrant by definition, as Salazar's government might have been rather a "postconstitutional rule."

Second, in regard to modern tyranny, I have confirmed that Strauss developed his argument which transcends the phases of political development: modern tyranny does not only conquer nature as the external environment, but also attempts to destroy human nature by using the power of science.⁷² Strauss was concerned about the fact that science would conquer nature in this way and eventually destroy human nature. Although it would be debatable whether all kinds of science destroy human nature, if science aims only at the pursuit of pleasure and the enhancement of human power and not at promoting the good in our human nature, science can be harmful to human nature. Following Strauss's opinion, we can state that it is certainly desirable that science makes human life more convenient, yet it is preferable that science and technology be used within a range that does not destroy human nature. In other words, we should aim to develop science and technology in a

⁷¹ Strauss, "Restatement on Xenophon's *Hiero*," *On Tyranny*, p. 211.

⁷² Interestingly, like Strauss, Kojève not only contrasted humans with nature, but also recognized nature (or animality) in humans. He boldly stated:

In order to negate, there must be something to negate: an existing *given* and hence an identical given-Being. And that is why man can exist freely—that is, humanly—only while living as an animal in a given natural World. But he lives *humanly* in it only to the extent that he *negates* this natural or animal given. (Kojève, *Introduction to the Reading of Hegel*, assembled by Raymond Queneau, edited by Allan Bloom and translated by James H. Nichols, Cornell University Press, 1980, p. 222 / *Introduction à la lecture de Hegel*, Gallimard, 1947, p. 494, emphasis in the original.)

The viewpoint of "conquest of nature" mentioned by Strauss has something in common with Kojève's view of the world derived from Christianity, in which humans "deny" or modify nature. However, as is clear from the previous quotation, Kojève did not think that such denial of the natural given meant the destruction of humanity, but on the contrary, he perceived humanity in the denial of the natural given.

way that does not destroy human nature. Also, as Strauss pointed out, if human beings can perfect their nature in closed societies, we must be skeptical of people simply aim for an open society by means of science. Hence, it can be said that we should reaffirm the modern role of philosophy as a discipline that assists people in aspiring to virtue or excellence in closed societies.

Given that Strauss's theory of tyranny is not limited to the realm of political science, but includes the perspective of human nature, it is still pertinent today to reconsider the mode of science and how it should be used in the future. Even though the tyrant is "postconstitutional" and superficially appears good, if modern tyranny uses science to destroy human nature without destroying human beings, we must reject such tyranny and explore the mode of science.

Acknowledgments

This article is based on my presentation at the University of Hawaii, Manoa, on March 10th, 2023. I would like to thank its organizer, professor Joseph Tanke, and the participants. I also would like to thank the editor of this journal, professor Todd Squires at Kindai University for his help, and professor emeritus Raoul Holland at Nanzan University, for having proofread and improved this article.

Translation

慧詳撰『弘贊法華傳』譯注稿 卷二・翻譯第二（前半）

An Annotated Translation of Huixiang's *Hongzhanfahuazhuan juan 2* Fanyi (the first half)

村田 みお (Mio Murata)*

ABSTRACT: This paper is a translation with notes of *Hongzhanfahuazhuan juan 2* Fanyi. *Hongzhanfahuazhuan* was written by the Buddhist monk Huixiang, who lived around the Early Tang dynasty. This annotated translation is based on a manuscript owned by the Todaiji Library in Nara. *Taisho-zo* was also based on that but contains typographical errors. For that reason, this paper reprinted the handwritten manuscript again, then proofread, translated into Japanese, and provided notes about related matters.

KEYWORDS: 慧詳, 弘贊法華傳, 翻譯, 初唐, 譯注

本稿は、初唐の人である慧詳が撰述した『弘贊法華傳』のうち、卷二・翻譯第二（前半）に譯注を施したものである。もとより筆者の不明による過誤遺漏は免れ得ず、ここに譯注稿として発表し博雅の指教を仰ぐ次第である。

凡例

- ・以下、本稿では『弘贊法華傳』を『弘贊』と略稱する。
- ・著者名は各巻巻頭の表記にばらつきがあり、巻一、巻二「惠詳」、巻三～八、十「慧詳」、巻九「慧祥」となっている。便宜上、本稿では最も多い「慧詳」で統一する。
- ・底本は東大寺圖書館藏寫本とする。東大寺圖書館藏寫本、二冊（巻一～五・巻六～十）、資料番號 111-154、寫眞帳請求番號 X1-111-199/200。奥書によると遼・天慶五年（一一一五）の高麗刊本をもとに、日本では保安元年（一一二〇、平安

* Associate Professor of Chinese Philosophy, Faculty of International Studies, Kindai University. E-mail: muratamio@intl.kindai.ac.jp

末)に寫本が作られた。東大寺圖書館藏寫本の書寫年代については、平林論文(四二頁)は室町期、横内論文(八頁)は平安末もしくは鎌倉初期、千本論文(二四三頁)は鎌倉初期とする。※平林盛得「弘贊法華傳」保安元年初傳説存疑(『書陵部紀要』第二〇號、一九六八、三九～五三頁)、横内裕人「高麗續藏經と中世日本——院政期の東アジア世界觀」(『佛教史學研究』第四五卷第一號、二〇〇二、一～三〇頁)、千本英史「弘贊法華傳」をめぐって(『シリーズ日本文學の展望を拓く1 東アジアの文學圈』笠間書院、二〇一七、二三五～二四八頁)参照。

- ・大正藏も東大寺圖書館藏寫本を底本とし、さらに甲本として續藏本を校勘記に擧げている。本稿では大正藏の翻刻・校勘記を参考としつつ、その遺漏を補うためあらためて底本からの翻刻を行った。
- ・底本では巻頭に各條の標題がまとめて列擧されているが、本稿では各條に割り付け、各巻での通し番號を振る。ただし巻二の巻頭目録には、各條の標題である人物名だけでなくその他の記述も含まれており、かつ各條本文と重複する部分が多い。繁雜さと混亂を避けるため、(前半)の冒頭に第〇條として巻頭目録を原文のみ掲げて元の状態を示し、第一條以下にはその中から人物名の部分のみを割り付ける。
- ・各條の標題、及び【原文】における太字及び※は【校勘】で言及する箇所を表す。底本で踊り字や見せ消ちによって示されている場合は、本稿ではそれに従って修正した原文を示す。
- ・標題、【原文】等では、表示困難な文字は〔 〕を用いて〔〇+〇〕等の形式で表す。小字・夾注は()で表す。
- ・【校勘】には、『弘贊』が基づいたとみられる出典や、同じ、または類似や関連する内容を収録する他書の情報等も合わせて示す。ただし『弘贊』以前の複数の書物が出典となりうる場合には早いものを優先的に擧げ、その他は必要に応じて言及する。また『弘贊』より後代のものまで網羅的に擧げるわけではない。
- ・【校勘】での文字の校訂においては、基本的には底本を改めた際に校勘を記すが、大正藏の翻刻に遺漏があった場合は全て記載する。
- ・【現代日本語譯】における()は筆者による補足や説明を表す。
- ・【注釋】には注番號は用いず、對應する原文の箇所を「・」を附して見出しに掲げた。見出し及び引用文は、長い場合は適宜省略し、「…」で省略箇所を示した。引用した原文における小字・夾注は()で表す場合がある。また必要に応じて()で元號や西曆年、説明を加える。大正藏に収録されるものには大正藏の巻・頁・段を示した。
- ・文字は基本的に第二水準までの舊字としたが、必ずしも統一されていない。

・なお一々注記はしないが、作成に当たっては例えば水谷眞成譯『大唐西域記』（中國古典文學大系、平凡社、一九七一、後に東洋文庫）、吉川忠夫・船山徹譯『高僧傳』（岩波文庫、二〇〇九～二〇一〇）、吉村誠・山口弘江『新國譯大藏經中國撰述部①—3 史傳部 續高僧傳 I』（大藏出版、二〇一二）等の先學の成果を適宜参照した。

〇、卷頭目録

【原文】

翻譯第二 譯經眞僞合十四人（眞十、僞四） 譯論二人

魏外國釋正无畏（法花三昧※經六卷、亦一本加正字）

晉焜煌釋竺法護（正法花經十卷、亦別出普門品光世音經）

東晉西域釋訶友（普門品經）

東晉釋支道根（方等法花經五卷）

僞秦天竺釋童壽（妙法蓮花經一部七卷）

宋潁州釋智嚴（法花三昧經一卷）

宋北涼河西王弟京聲（觀世音經）

齊上林寺釋法獻（妙法蓮花經提婆達多品）

隋西域釋德志（妙法蓮花經普門品重誦偈）

唐西域釋法密（妙法蓮花經藥草喻品、加五紙、諸呪竝異）

齊竟陵王蕭子良（抄妙法蓮花經、抄法花藥王經）

梁大學博士江泌女（法花經一卷） 右二條非正經

古舊二錄失譯經（法花光瑞菩薩現壽經）

隋費長房注僞經（妙法蓮花度量天地經、妙法蓮花天地變異經） 右二條疑僞

後魏西域沙門道希（妙法蓮華經論二卷）

後魏中天竺沙門寶意（妙法蓮花經論一卷）

一、魏外國釋正无畏（魏の外國の釋正無畏）

【原文】

法花三昧※經六卷（一本加正字）。

右。外國沙門支疆梁接、魏言正无畏、以魏高貴郷※公世甘露元年七月於交州譯、沙門道馨筆受。無別廣傳、經目云然。

【校勘】

この條は【注釋】に挙げた費長房『歷代三寶記』卷五譯經魏吳錄に基づくであろう。

「昧」 大正藏は「味」に誤り、校勘記甲本に「昧カ」とする。卷頭目録の小字も同じ。

「郷」 大正藏は「卿」とし、底本も確かに「卿」とするのが相應しい字であるが、字形の近似、及び正史等に高貴郷公とされることにより「郷」に改める。

【現代日本語譯】

『法花三昧經』六卷（ある一本には正字が加えられている）。

右。外國の沙門である支疆梁接、魏では正無畏という人が、魏の高貴郷公の治世である甘露元年（二五六）七月に交州で翻譯し、沙門の道馨が筆受した。他に廣く傳承されているわけではなく、經典目録にこう書かれていた。

【注釋】

・法花三昧經六卷

『出三藏記集』卷四新集續撰失譯雜經錄（大正五五、三二上～三七中）

正法華三昧經六卷（疑即是正法華經之別名）。……右合四百六十部、凡六百七十五卷。詳校群錄、名數已定、竝未見其本、今闕此經。

『歷代三寶記』卷五譯經魏吳錄（大正四九、五六下）

法華三昧經六部（一本有正字。祐云失譯）。

右一部六卷。高貴郷公世甘露元年七月、外國沙門支疆梁接、魏言正無畏、於交州譯。沙門道馨筆受。祐云失譯。房檢、乃見竺道祖魏世錄及始興錄。若依交州及始興錄地、應入吳錄。今據年及魏錄收附此。

『歷代三寶記』が言う僧祐『出三藏記集』の失譯への分類については、恐らく闕本の「正法華三昧經六卷」を指すだろう。『出三藏記集』には他に見存の失譯「法華三昧經一卷」（大正五五、三〇中～三二上）も著録されているが卷數の違いが大きく、これは本卷第六條の「法花三昧經一卷」に關連すると思われる。現行の『歷代三寶記』は「六部」に作るが、それを襲う『大唐內典錄』卷二前魏朝曹氏傳譯佛經錄（大正五五、二二七上）は「法華三昧經六卷」とし、「部」は誤寫であろう。

・一本加正字

『漢書』卷三十藝文志六藝略小學

元帝時黃門令史游作急就篇、成帝時將作大匠李長作元尚篇、皆蒼頡中正字也。

『隋書』卷三十二經籍志小學

後漢鐫刻七經、著於石碑、皆蔡邕所書。魏正始中、又立三字石經、相承以爲七經正字。

恐らく經典中の異體字・俗字等についてその時代の標準的な字を書き添えたことを意味するだろう。ここで言う一本が指すのは複數部あった中の一部六卷全体か、それとも一部六卷の内の一巻かは詳らかではない。

・外國沙門支疆梁接

法華三昧經の譯者として他の文獻にも「支疆良樓」「支疆良接」「無畏三藏」等の表記で記録されているが、『歴代三寶記』以上の情報は見出せない。なお後世の禪宗における傳承であるが、北宋の契嵩『傳法正宗論』卷上に「中天竺國沙門號支疆梁樓」（大正五一、七七四下）、南宋の智昭『人天眼目』に「魏天竺三藏支疆梁樓」（大正四八、三二七中）が見え、高貴郷公の次の元帝の時代に洛陽に來たとされている。先に南方に到着し、その後洛陽に赴いたとすれば齟齬はしない。

・沙門道馨

傳記は見出せず未詳。『古今譯經圖紀』『開元釋教錄』『貞元新定釋教目錄』では「竺道馨」とする。

・筆受

譯經の場において口頭での翻譯を文字で筆記する係を指す。

『出三藏記集』卷七般舟三昧經記（大正五五、四八下）

般舟三昧經。光和二年十月八日、天竺菩薩竺朔佛於洛陽出、菩薩法護、時傳言者、月支菩薩支識、授與河南洛陽孟福字元士、隨侍菩薩張蓮字少安筆受。

筆受を含め、佛典の譯場における役割分担については、船山徹『佛典はどう漢譯されたのか』（岩波書店、二〇一三）第三章「譯はこうして作られた」を参照。

・經目

『出三藏記集』卷四新集續撰失譯雜經錄（大正五五、三一上）

雜譬喻經一卷（凡十一事。安法師載竺法護經目有譬喻經三百首二十五卷、混無名目、難可分別）。

二、晉燉煌釋竺法護（西晉の敦煌の釋竺法護）

【原文】

正法華經十卷。

右。沙門竺曇摩羅刹、此云法護、其先月氏人、本姓支氏、世居燉煌郡。年八歲出家、事外國沙門竺高座爲師。誦經日萬言、過目即能。天性純懿、操行精苦、篤志好學、萬里尋師。是以博覽六經、遊心七籍、雖世務毀譽、未嘗介抱。是時晉武之世、寺廟圖像雖崇京邑、而方等深經※蘊在葱外。護乃慨然發憤、志弘大道、遂隨師至西域、遊歷諸國。外國異言三十六種、書亦如之、護皆遍學、貫綜詰訓、音義字體、無不備識。遂大齋梵經、還歸中夏。自燉煌至長安、沿路傳譯、寫爲晉文。所獲※賢劫、正法花等、一百六十五部。孜孜所務、唯以弘道爲業、終身寫譯、勞不告倦。經法所以廣流中夏者、護之力也。以西晉大康七年八月十日、護手執梵本、口宣出前經二十七品、優婆塞聶承遠、張仕明、張仲政※共筆受。九月二日訖。天竺沙門竺力、龜茲居士帛元信共參校。元嘉※元年二月六日重覆。又元康元年、長安孫伯虎、虞世雅等以四月十五日寫素訖。護後立寺於長安青門外、精勤行道。於是德化遐布※、聲蓋四遠、僧徒數千咸所宗事。春秋七十有八、與門徒避地東下、至灑池遘疾而卒。

普門品經 光世音經

右二經、亦沙門法護別出。

【校勘】

この條は【注釋】に挙げた『高僧傳』卷一譯經篇竺曇摩羅刹傳と『出三藏記集』卷八正法華經記に基づき、末尾の二經については『歷代三寶記』卷六譯經西晉錄曇摩羅刹に基づくであろう。

「經」 大正藏この一字を脱し、校勘記甲本は上の「深」について「+教力」とする。

「獲」 底本「護」に作る。大正藏「譯」に誤る。『出三藏記集』『高僧傳』ともに「獲」に作るのにより、誤寫として改める。

「政」 大正藏「改」に誤る。

「元嘉」 元嘉は劉宋の年号にしかなく、何らかの誤りである。「正法華經十卷 及び 竺曇摩羅刹」の注に挙げた『出三藏記集』卷八正法華經記は「元年二月六日」とするのみである。太康から元康の間の元年二月であれば太熙元年（二九〇）か永平元年（二九一）が相應しいだろうが、ひとまず改めない。

「布」 大正藏「市」に誤る。

【現代日本語譯】

『正法華經』十卷。

右。沙門の竺曇摩羅刹、中國では法護といい、その先祖は月氏の人で、俗姓は支氏、代々燉煌郡に住んでいた。八歳で出家し、外國の沙門である竺高座に師事した。誦經を日々一萬言もし、一度讀んだらたちまち會得した。持って生まれた性質は立派で美しく、日頃の行いに苦勞を厭わず勵み、一途に學問を愛し、萬里もの遠くまで師を探し求めた。そうして六經を廣く讀みあさり、七籍に没頭し、俗世間の毀譽褒貶など齒牙にも掛けなかった。西晉の武帝の治世において、佛寺や佛畫、佛像は都で盛行していたが、大乘の奥深い經典は葱嶺（パミール高原）の向こうに隠されていた。法護はそこで気持ちが高ぶって奮い立ち、佛教の大いなる道を廣めんと志して、師に付き随って西域に行き、諸國を渡り歩いた。外國では異なった言語が三十六種、文字も同様であったが、法護は全て學び盡くし、訓詁に精通しており、音義と字體についても知らないことはなかった。かくして梵文の經典を大量に持って、中國へと帰ってきた。燉煌から長安まで、道すがら翻譯し、中國の言葉で書き寫した。手に入れたのは『賢劫經』『正法花經』等、百六十五部であった。一心に努力し、ただ佛道を廣めることを自らの仕事とし、命ある限り經典の書寫と翻譯をし、疲れてしまっても草臥れたとは口に出さなかった。經典の教えが中國の地に幅廣く流布したのは、法護のお陰なのである。西晉の太康七年（二八六）八月十日に、法護は梵文の經典を手にとり、前述の『正法華經』二十七品を口頭で翻譯し、優婆塞の聶承遠、張仕明、張仲政が共に筆受した。九月二日に終了した。天竺の沙門の竺力、龜茲の居士の帛元信が共に校訂した。元嘉元年二月六日に再度校正した。また元康元年（二九一）、長安孫伯虎、虞世雅らが四月十五日に絹本に書寫しおえた。法護は後に長安の青門の外に寺を建て、佛道の修業に勤しんだ。そこで彼の徳による感化は遙か遠くにまで廣がり、その名聲は四方の果てまで覆い盡くし、僧侶數千人にこぞって師事された。七十八歳の時、門下の弟子とともに難を逃れて東へ向かい、灑池まで來たところで病に罹ってしまい亡くなった。

『普門品經』 『光世音經』

右の二經も、沙門法護が別に譯出したものである。

【注釋】

・正法華經十卷 及び 竺曇摩羅刹

『出三藏記集』卷二新集撰出經律論錄（大正五五、七中）

賢劫經七卷（舊録云、賢劫三昧經、或云、賢劫定意經。元康元年七月二十一日出）。正法華經十卷（二十七品。舊録云、正法華經、或云方等正法華經。太康七年八月十日出）。

『出三藏記集』卷八正法華經記（大正五五、五六下）

太康七年八月十日、燉煌月支菩薩沙門法護手執胡經、口宣出正法華經二十七品、授優婆塞聶承遠、張仕明、張仲政、共筆受。竺德成、竺文盛、嚴威伯、續文承、趙叔初、張文龍、陳長玄等共勸助歡喜。九月二日訖。天竺沙門竺力、龜茲居士帛元信共參校。元年二月六日重覆。又元康元年、長安孫伯虎以四月十五日寫素解。

『歷代三寶紀』卷六譯經西晉錄曇摩羅察（大正四九、六二上）

正法華經十卷（太康七年出。清信士張士明、張仲正及法獻等筆受。或七卷。見聶道真錄）。

『高僧傳』卷一譯經篇晉長安竺曇摩羅刹傳（大正五〇、三二六下～三二七上）

竺曇摩羅刹、此云法護、其先月支人、本姓支氏、世居燉煌郡。年八歲出家、事外國沙門竺高座爲師。誦經日萬言、過目則能。天性純懿、操行精苦。篤志好學、萬里尋師。是以博覽六經、遊心七籍。雖世務毀譽、未嘗介抱。是時晉武之世、寺廟圖像雖崇京邑、而方等深經蘊在葱外。護乃慨然發憤、志弘大道、遂隨師至西域、遊歷諸國。外國異言三十六種、書亦如之、護皆遍學、貫綜詰訓、音義字體、無不備識。遂大齋梵經、還歸中夏。自燉煌至長安、沿路傳譯、寫爲晉文。所獲賢劫、正法華、光讚等一百六十五部。孜孜所務、唯以弘通爲業。終身寫譯、勞不告勸。經法所以廣流中華者、護之力也。……後立寺於長安青門外、精勤行道。於是德化遐布、聲蓋四遠、僧徒數千、咸所宗事。及晉惠西奔、關中擾亂、百姓流移、護與門徒避地東下、至澗池遭疾而卒。春秋七十有八。……時有清信士聶承遠、明解有才、篤志務法。護公出經、多參正文句。超日明經初譯、頗多煩重、承遠刪正、得今行二卷。其所詳定、類皆如此。承遠有子道真、亦善梵學。此君父子比辭雅便、無累於古。又有竺法首、陳士倫、孫伯虎、虞世雅等、皆共承護旨、執筆詳校。

『高僧傳』の竺曇摩羅刹傳はそれに先立つ『出三藏記集』卷十三竺法護傳（大正五五、九七下）を踏まえるが、『出三藏記集』は持ち歸って譯した經典數を「凡一百四十九部」とし、「虞世雅」の名も見えず、その他細部の表現も相違する。『弘贊』は全體に『高僧傳』に基づきつつ『出三藏記集』の正法華經記を加えたと考えられる。ただし何故『高僧傳』では末尾に名が擧げられるのみの虞世雅を『正法華經』翻譯に携わった一人としたのかは未詳。

・月氏

『史記』卷百二十三 大宛列傳

大月氏在大宛西可二千里、居媯水北。其南則大夏、西則安息、北則康居。行國也、隨畜移徙、與匈奴同俗。控弦者可一二十萬。故時疆、輕匈奴、及冒頓立、攻破月氏、至匈奴老上單于、殺月氏王、以其頭爲飲器。始月氏居敦煌、祁連間、及爲匈奴所敗、乃遠去、過宛、西擊大夏而臣之、遂都媯水北、爲王庭。其餘小衆不能去者、保南山羌、號小月氏。

『魏書』卷百二西域傳小月氏國

小月氏國、都富樓沙城。其王本大月氏王寄多羅子也。寄多羅爲匈奴所逐、西徙後令其子守此城、因號小月氏焉。在波路西南、去代一萬六千六百里。先居西平、張掖之間、被服頗與羌同。其俗以金銀錢爲貨。隨畜牧移徙、亦類匈奴。其城東十里有佛塔、周三百五十步、高八十丈。自佛塔初建、計至武定八年、八百四十二年、所謂百丈佛圖也。

・燉煌郡

『晉書』卷十四地理志上涼州敦煌郡

敦煌郡。漢置。統縣十二、戶六千三百。昌蒲、敦煌、龍勒、陽關、效穀、廣至、宜禾、冥安、深泉、伊吾、新鄉、乾齊。

・過目即能

康僧會譯『六度集經』卷五忍辱度無極章第四十五（大正三、二六上）

四姓又聞、厥恨如前、以衆名寶請歸悲泣、并教書數、仰觀俯占、衆道之術過目即能。稟性仁孝、言輒導化。國人稱聖、儒士雲集。

・天性純懿

『文選』卷四十七袁宏三國名臣序贊

子瑜都長、體性純懿、諫而不犯、正而不毅。

李善注云、謝承後漢書曰、朱皓德行純懿。

・操行精苦

『史記』卷百十七司馬相如傳

相如奏賦以哀二世行失也。其辭曰……嗚呼哀哉。操行之不得兮、墳墓蕪穢而不脩兮、魂無歸而不食。

『世說新語』文學

孫安國往殷中軍許共論、往反精苦、客主無間。左右進食、冷而復煖者數四。

『出三藏記集』卷七王僧孺慧印三昧及濟方等學二經序讚（大正五五、五〇下）

副法師者、戒行精苦、恬憺無爲。

・篤志好學

『論語』子張

子夏曰、博學而篤志、切問而近思、仁在其中矣。

『後漢書』傳十六侯霸傳

霸矜嚴有威容、家累千金、不事產業。篤志好學、師事九江太守房元、治穀梁春秋、爲元都講。

・萬里尋師

『後漢書』傳五十三李固傳

少好學、常步行尋師、不遠千里、遂究覽墳籍、結交英賢。

・博覽六經

『漢書』卷八十七上揚雄傳

雄少而好學、不爲章句、訓詁通而已、博覽無所不見。

『漢書』卷六武帝紀贊

孝武初立、卓然罷黜百家、表章六經。

顏師古注云、六經、謂易、詩、書、春秋、禮、樂也。

・遊心七籍

『莊子』內篇人間世

且夫乘物以遊心、託不得已以養中、至矣。

『蔡中郎集』卷二玄文先生李子材銘

休少以好學、游心典謨、既綜七經、又精羣緯。

『後漢書』傳二十五張純傳

乃案七經識、明堂圖、河間古辟雍記、孝武太山明堂制度、及平帝時議、欲具奏之。

李賢注云、七經、謂詩、書、禮、樂、易、春秋及論語也。

・世務毀譽

『漢書』卷七十二王吉傳

陛下躬聖質、總萬方、帝王圖籍日陳于前、惟思世務、將興太平。

『晉書』卷五十五夏侯湛傳

不與人路同嗜欲、不與世務齊榮辱。故能入無窮之門、享不死之年。

『莊子』內篇德充符

死生存亡、窮達貧富、賢與不肖、毀譽、饑渴、寒暑、是事之變、命之行也。

・晉武之世、寺廟圖像雖崇京邑

西晉の武帝司馬炎は二六五年～二九〇年在位、都は洛陽。

『晉書』卷三武帝紀

武皇帝諱炎、字安世、文帝長子也。寬惠仁厚、沈深有度量。

『魏書』釋老志

自洛中構白馬寺、盛飾佛圖、畫迹甚妙、爲四方式。凡宮塔制度、猶依天竺舊狀而重構之、從一級至三、五、七、九。世人相承、謂之浮圖、或云佛圖。晉世、洛中佛圖有四十二所矣。漢世沙門、皆衣赤布、後乃易以雜色。

・深經

竺法護譯『正法華經』卷一善權品（大正九、六九中）

爾等當信如來誠諦所說深經、誼甚微妙、言輒無虛。

・蘊在葱嶺

『漢書』卷九十六上西域傳

西域以孝武時始通、本三十六國、其後稍分至五十餘、皆在匈奴之西、烏孫之南。南北有大山、中央有河、東西六千餘里、南北千餘里。東則接漢、隄以玉門、陽關、西則限以葱嶺。……自玉門、陽關出西域有兩道。從鄯善傍南山北、波河西行至莎車、爲南道。南道西踰葱嶺則出大月氏、安息。自車師前王廷隨北山、波河西行至疏勒、爲北道。北道西踰葱嶺則出大宛、康居、奄蔡焉。

顏師古注云、西河舊事云、葱嶺其山高大、上悉生葱、故以名焉。

『出三藏記集』卷十道安阿毘曇序（大正五五、七二上）

其爲經也、富莫上焉、邃莫加焉。……然乃在大荒之外、葱嶺之表、雖欲從之、未由見也。

・外國異言三十六種、書亦如之

『出三藏記集』卷一胡漢譯經文字音義同異記（大正五五、四中）

唯梵及佉樓爲世勝文、故天竺諸國謂之天書。西方寫經雖同祖梵文、然三十六國往往有異。

・貫綜

『蔡中郎集』卷一朱公叔議

益州府君貫綜典術、率由舊章、始與諸儒考禮定議。

・中夏

『文選』卷一班固東都賦

俯仰乎乾坤、參象乎聖躬、目中夏而布德、瞰四裔而抗稜。

・賢劫

『出三藏記集』卷七出賢劫經記（大正五五、四八下）

賢劫經、永康元年七月二十一日、月支菩薩竺法護、從罽賓沙門得是賢劫三昧、手執口宣。時竺法友從洛寄來、筆受者趙文龍。使其功德福流十方、普遂蒙恩、離於罪蓋。其是經者、次見千佛、稽受道化、受菩薩決、致無生忍、至一切法、十方亦爾。

『歷代三寶紀』卷六譯經西晉錄曇摩羅察（大正四九、六二上）

賢劫經七卷（元康元年出、趙文龍筆受。或十卷、十三卷。舊錄云、永康年出。見聶道真錄）。

また「正法華經十卷 及び 竺曇摩羅刹」の注に引く『出三藏記集』卷二新集撰出經律論錄竺法護を参照。

・孜孜

『尚書』益稷

禹拜曰、都、帝、予何言、予思日孜孜。

・經法

『正法華經』卷一光瑞品（大正九、六四上）

大聖神足放大光明、照于東方萬八千土。諸佛世界自然爲現、所說經法皆遙聞之。

・聶承遠

『出三藏記集』卷十三竺法護傳（大正五五、九八上）

初護於西域得超日明經胡本譯出、頗多繁重。時有信士聶承遠、乃更詳正文偈、刪爲二卷。今之所傳經是也。承遠明練有才理、篤志法務、護公出經、多參正焉。

また「正法華經十卷 及び 竺曇摩羅刹」の注に引く『高僧傳』卷一譯經篇晉長安竺曇摩羅刹傳を参照。

・張仕明、張仲政 及び 天竺沙門竺力

この三人の名は『正法華經』の翻譯に參與した者として以外には見出せなかった。

・龜茲居士帛元信

龜茲は現在の新疆ウイグル自治区のクチャ。

『漢書』卷九十六下西域傳

龜茲國、王治延城、去長安七千四百八十里。戸六千九百七十、口八萬一千三百一十七、勝兵二萬一千七十六人。……南與精絕、東南與且末、西南與杆彌、北與烏孫、西與姑墨接。能鑄冶、有鉛。東至都護治所烏壘城三百五十里。

『晉書』卷九十七四夷傳西戎龜茲國

龜茲國西去洛陽八千二百八十里、俗有城郭、其城三重、中有佛塔廟千所。人以田種畜牧爲業、男女皆翦髮垂項。王宮壯麗、煥若神居。武帝太康中、其王遣子入侍。惠懷末、以中國亂、遣使貢方物於張重華。苻堅時、堅遣其將呂光率衆七萬伐之、其王白純距境不降、光進軍討平之。

帛元信の傳記は不明であるが、『正法華經』以外にも竺法護による『漸備經』（『出三藏記集』卷二新集撰出經律論錄、大正五五、九下、卷九漸備經十住胡名并書叙、大正五五、六二中）、『須眞天子經』（『出三藏記集』卷二新集撰出經律論錄、大正五五、九下、卷七須眞天子經記、大正五五、四八中）の翻譯に參與している。

・重覆

覆は覆校の意である。次のように法護が自分で校正した例もある。

『出三藏記集』卷九如來大哀經記（大正五五、六三中）

元康元年七月七日、燉煌菩薩支法護手執胡經、經名如來大哀、口授聶承遠、道眞、正書晉言。以其年八月二十三日訖。護親自覆校。

・長安孫伯虎、虞世雅

この二人についても、『正法華經』の翻譯に參與した者として以外には見出せなかった。

・寫素

『三國志』卷二魏書文帝曹丕黃初七年裴松之注引胡冲吳曆

帝以素書所著典論及詩賦餉孫權、又以紙寫一通與張昭。

・長安青門

青門は長安城の十二門のうち、東南に位置する霸城門の通稱。

『漢書』卷九十九中王莽傳

七月辛酉、霸城門災、民間所謂青門也。

『三輔黃圖』卷一都城十二門

長安城東出南頭第一門霸城門、民見門色青、名曰青城門、或曰青門。

また竺法護は泰始二年（二六六）に青門の内側の白馬寺でも『須眞天子經』を譯している。

『出三藏記集』卷七須眞天子經記（大正五五、四八中）

須眞天子經、太始二年十一月八日、於長安青門内白馬寺中、天竺菩薩曇摩羅察口授出之。時傳言者、安文惠、帛元信。手受者、聶承遠、張玄泊、孫休。達十二月三十日未時訖。

・避地

『漢書』卷百上敘傳上

始皇之末、班壹避墜於樓煩、致馬牛羊數千羣。

顔師古注云、墜、古地字。樓煩、鴈門之縣。

・澠池

『晉書』卷十四地理志上司州弘農郡

弘農郡。漢置。統縣六、戸一萬四千。弘農、湖、陝、宜陽、黽池、華陰。

・普門品經 及び 光世音經

『出三藏記集』卷二新集撰出經律論錄竺法護（大正五五、八中）

普門經一卷（一本云普門品。太康八年正月十一日出）。

『出三藏記集』卷二新集異出經錄（大正五五、一四中）

普門經（竺法護出普門品一卷、祇多蜜出普門品一卷）。右一經、二人異出。

『出三藏記集』卷四新集續撰失譯雜經錄（大正五五、二二中）

光世音經一卷（出正法華經。或云光世音普門品）。

『歷代三寶記』卷六譯經西晉錄曇摩羅察（大正四九、六二下～六四下）

普門品經一卷（太康八年正月出。見聶道眞錄）。……光世音經一卷（出正法華經）。

『出三藏記集』では『光世音經』は失譯に分類されているが、『歷代三寶記』からは竺法護譯に含められる。

三、東晉西域釋訶友※（東晉の西域の釋訶友）

【原文】

普門品經。

右。東晉西域沙門祇多蜜、晉言訶友※譯、與法護譯者大同小異。

【校勘】

この條は【注釋】に擧げた『歷代三寶記』卷七譯經東晉錄祇多蜜に基づくであろう。

「友」 大正藏は巻頭目録及び本文ともに「支」に作るが、底本は巻頭目録では「友」に近く、本文では二画目の左下への払いが短いためどちらかと言えば「支」に近い。しかし『望月佛教大辞典』が「ギダミツ 祇多蜜」の條に「gItamitra」とするように、音寫の蜜は恐らく mitra に当たり、例えば帛尸梨密多羅は吉友と譯される。また『歴代三寶紀』『大唐内典録』は「友」に作る。以上により本稿では「友」とする。

【現代日本語譯】

『普門品經』。

右。東晉の西域の沙門の祇多蜜、晉では訶友という人が翻譯し、法護が翻譯したものと大同小異である。

【注釋】

・普門品經 及び 祇多蜜

『出三藏記集』卷二新集異出經錄（大正五五、一四下）

普門經（竺法護出普門品一卷。祇多蜜出普門品一卷）右一經、二人異出。

『歴代三寶紀』卷七譯經東晉錄祇多蜜（大正四九、七一下）

普門品經一卷（第二出、與法護出大同。見道祖錄及三藏記）。

右二十五部合四十六卷。西域沙門祇多蜜、晉言訶友譯。諸錄盡云。祇多蜜晉世出、譯名多同、計不應虛。若非咸洛、應是江南、未詳何帝。一部見僧祐出三藏集記、已外竝出雜別諸錄所載。

四、東晉釋支道根（東晉の釋支道根）

【原文】

方等法花經五卷。

右。沙門支道根、東晉成帝咸康元年譯出。

【校勘】

この條は【注釋】に擧げた『歴代三寶紀』卷七譯經東晉錄支道根に基づくであろう。

【現代日本語譯】

『方等法花經』五卷。

右。沙門の支道根が、東晉の成帝の咸康元年（三三五）に譯出した。

【注釋】

・方等法華經五卷

『歷代三寶紀』卷七譯經東晉錄支道根（大正四九、六九上）

阿闍佛刹諸菩薩學成品經二卷（太康年出、第二譯、與支謙譯大同小異）。方等法華經五卷（咸康元年譯）。右二經合七卷、成帝世、沙門支道根出、並見竺道祖晉世雜錄。

五、僞秦天竺釋童壽（僞政權の秦の天竺の釋童壽）

【原文】

妙法蓮花經一部七卷。

右。沙門鳩摩羅什、此云童壽、天竺人也。家世國相、什祖父達多、名重於國。父鳩摩炎有懿節、避相位出家、東度葱嶺。龜茲王聞其棄榮、甚敬慕之、自出郊迎、請爲國師。王妹年始二十、才悟明敏、且體有赤鬚、法生智子。諸國聘之、並不行。及見炎、心欲當之、乃逼以妻焉、既而懷什。什在胎、其母慧解倍常。聞雀梨大寺名德既多、又有得道之僧、即與王族貴女、德行諸尼、彌日設供、請齊聽法。什母忽自通天竺語、難問之辭、必窮淵致、衆咸歎之。有羅漢達麼瞿沙曰、此必懷智子、爲說舍利弗在胎之證。及什生之後※、還忘前言。頃之、什母樂欲出家、專精匪懈、學得初果。什年七歲、亦俱出家、從師受經、日誦千偈。偈有三十二字、凡三萬二千言。誦毘曇既過、師授其義、即自通達。於是遍歷諸師、廣學經教、一聞能受、盡其隅奧。又外道經書、亦悉披覽。後什母謂什曰、方等深教應大闡眞丹、傳之東土※、唯爾之力。尋與母別。苻堅建元十三年正月、太史奏云、有星見外國分野、當有大德智人入朝中國。堅曰、朕聞西域有鳩摩羅什、即遣使求之、未致而卒。及後秦姚興弘始三年九月、來儀至此。以其年十二月、與興相見、興待以國師之禮、甚見優寵。悟言相對、即淹留終日、研※微造盡、即窮年忘倦。自大法東被始於漢明、涉歷魏晉、經論漸多、而支竺所出多滯文格義。興少崇三寶、銳志講集。什既至止、仍請入西明閣及逍遙園、譯出衆經。什既率多諳誦、无不究盡、轉能漢言、音譯流便。既覽舊經、義多紕僻、皆由先度失旨、不與梵本相應。於是興使沙門僧碧、僧遷、法欽、道流、道恒、道標、僧叡、僧肇等八百餘人諮※受什旨。弘始八年夏、於長安大寺更集四方義學沙門二千餘人、譯出此經。又惠叡法師喻疑論曰、法花正本於于闐國揮光重壤、涌出空中、而得流此。司隸校尉左將軍安城侯姚崇、疑韻玄門、宅心世表、注誠斯典※、爲之傳寫、至今流布。又杯度比丘※、不測人也。在彭城聞什在長安、乃歎曰、吾與此子戲別三百餘年、杳※然未期、遲有遇於來生耳。什未終日、少※覺四大不

愈、乃口出三番神呪、令外國弟子誦之以自救、未及致力、轉覺危殆。於是力疾與衆僧告別曰、因法相遇、殊未盡伊心。方復後世、惻愴可言。自以暗昧謬充傳譯、若所傳无謬者、當使焚身之後、舌不焦爛。以僞秦弘始十一年八月二十日卒於長安。是歲、晉義熙五年也。即於逍遙園依外國法以火焚尸、薪滅形碎、唯舌不灰。

【校勘】

この條は【注釋】に挙げた『高僧傳』卷二譯經篇鳩摩羅什傳、『出三藏記集』卷八慧觀法華宗要序、『出三藏記集』卷五慧叡喻疑、『出三藏記集』卷八僧叡法華經後序に基づくであろう。

「後」 大正藏は下に「復」あり。底本は「後」の上に「後」の書き損じらしき一字あり、右側「ヒ」で削除を示している。書き損じと「後」を何らかの混乱により「後復」としたようである。

「土」 底本「出」に作る。『高僧傳』に従い改める。

「研」 大正藏「斫」に誤る。

「謔」 底本「[言+恣]」に作る。『高僧傳』に従い改める。

「典」 底本は「典」の下部の二画がなく「曲」に見える。『高僧傳』に従い改める。

「丘」 大正藏は下に「尼」あり。大正藏校勘記甲本やなし。底本は「丘」の上に「尼」があり、右側二点で削除を示している。何らかの混乱であろう。

「杳」 底本「香」に作る。大正藏校勘記甲本は「杳」に作る。『高僧傳』に従い改める。

「日少」 底本「少日」に作る。『高僧傳』に従い改める。

【現代日本語譯】

『妙法蓮華經』一部七卷。

右。沙門の鳩摩羅什、中國では童壽といい、天竺の人である。代々大臣を務める家柄で、鳩摩羅什の祖父の達多是、國中に名聲を博していた。父の鳩摩炎は優れた節度を持っており、大臣の位を忌避して出家し、東の方へと葱嶺（パミール高原）を越えた。龜茲王は彼が榮えある身分を捨て去ったのを耳にして、敬慕することしきりで、自分で郊外まで出迎えにいき、國師になってくれるよう頼んだ。二十歳になったばかりの王の妹は才氣煥發、しかも體には赤いほくろがあり、智恵に富む子を生むだろうとされていた。諸國から縁談が來たのだが、どこにも行きはしなかった。鳩摩炎の姿を目にすると、彼と結ばれたがったので、無理矢理に妻にさせたと、程なくして鳩摩羅什を身籠もった。鳩摩羅什がお腹にいと、母親は智恵が日頃よりも大幅に増した。雀梨大寺には名のある有徳の僧が多い上に、得道の僧もいると聞いて、すぐに王族の貴婦人、徳行に優れた尼僧たちとともに、幾日もお供

えを捧げ、齋會を開いてもらい説法を聴いた。鳩摩羅什の母は不意に天竺の言葉がひとりで分かるようになり、疑問点を質す發言はどれも奥深い意味まで極め盡くしていたので、居合わせた一同みな感服した。阿羅漢の達磨瞿沙という人が「これは智恵のある子を身籠もったに違いない」と言い、智恵ある舍利弗が母親のお腹にいた時の證しを話してやった。ところが鳩摩羅什が生まれたら、前に言ったことを忘れてしまった。暫くすると、鳩摩羅什の母は出家しようと思い、一心不亂に修行して初果を得た。鳩摩羅什は七歳で一緒に出家し、師の下で經典の教えを受け、毎日一千偈を誦誦した。一つの偈が三十二字なので、合わせて三萬二千言であった。毘曇（アビダルマ）を誦誦し終わったので、師がその意味を教授したところ、すぐさま通曉してしまった。そこで幾人もの師の下を遍歴して、幅廣く經典の教えを學び、一度聞いただけで飲み込むことができ、奥深くまで限無く極め盡した。また佛教以外の經典についても、残さず目を通した。後に母親が鳩摩羅什に言った。「大乘の深き教えは眞丹で大いに盛んになるべきです。これを東の地へと傳えられるのは、お前の力によってのみです」。間もなく母親と別れた。苻堅の建元十三年（三七七）正月、太史が「星が外國の分野に現れたので、きっと徳高き智恵ある人が中國へと拝謁にやって来るでしょう」と上奏した。苻堅は「朕は西域に鳩摩羅什なる者がいると耳にしたぞ」と言い、すぐに使者を遣わして捜し求めたが、果たせないまま亡くなった。後秦の姚興の弘始三年（四〇一）九月になって、この地へとやって來た。その年の十二月に姚興と會い、姚興は國師の禮でもてなし、大層厚遇された。二人差し向かいで言葉を交わすと、日がな一日腰を据えっぱなし、捉えがたい眞理をとことん探求すると、一年を経ても飽きなかった。後漢の明帝の時に大いなる佛法が東方の地に廣まり始めてから、魏晉の世を経て、經典や論書は次第に増えていったが、しかし支謙や竺法護の譯は文章の流れが悪く意味が通じにくいことが多かった。姚興は若い頃から三寶を尊び、經典講義の集まりに熱心であった。鳩摩羅什がやって來たので、西明閣と逍遙園に入ってもらい、多くの經典を譯出させた。鳩摩羅什は大抵のものを誦んじており、何でも極め盡くしていた上に、徐々に漢語も上達し、發音も譯も流暢であった。舊來の經典を見たところ、意味上の誤りが多かったが、それらはみな以前の翻譯のやり方では主旨を取り違えていて、梵文の本と對應していないせいであった。そこで姚興は沙門の僧碧、僧遷、法欽、道流、道恒、道標、僧叡、僧肇ら八百人餘りに鳩摩羅什に教えを請わせた。弘始八年（四〇六）夏、長安の大寺であらためて方々の教理学に優れた沙門二千人餘りを集め、この經典を譯出した。また惠叡法師の喩疑論に「法華の正本は于填（于闐、ホータン）の大國において、地下で光を放ち、空中へと出現して、この地へと傳わることができた」と言う。司隸校尉左將軍安城侯の姚崇は玄妙な佛の法門に従い、俗世の外に心を寄せ、『法華經』に歸依して、この經典を轉寫し、今でも流布して

いる。また杯度比丘は計り知れない人物であった。彭城で鳩摩羅什が長安にいると耳にして、「私はあやつと冗談を言って別れてから三百年餘り、次はいつ會えるやらさっぱりで、來世で巡り會えるよう心待ちにするばかりだ」と歎息した。鳩摩羅什が亡くなる前のある日、やや體の具合が良くないと感じたので、神呪を三度口に出し、外國の弟子に誦えさせて助かろうとしたのだが、まだその力を發揮しないうちに、いよいよ危ないと思った。そこで病身を押しして衆僧に別れを告げて言った。「佛法の縁で巡り會えたのに、まだその心を盡くせてはおらぬ。またもやこの世を去ろうとするに当たり、この痛ましさは何とも言い難い。私は愚昧だというのに誤って翻譯の任に当たってしまったが、もし譯したものに間違いがなければ、きっと遺骸を燃やした後に舌は焼けずに残されるだろう」。偽政權の秦の弘始十一年（四〇九）八月二十日に長安で卒した。この年は東晉の義熙五年である。ただちに逍遙園において外國の法に則り火で亡骸を燃やしたところ、薪が燃え盡き體が崩れ去っても、舌だけは灰にならなかった。

【注釋】

・妙法蓮華經一部七卷

『出三藏記集』卷二新集撰出經律論錄（五五、一〇下～一一上）

新法華經七卷（弘始八年夏於長安大寺譯出）。……右三十五部、凡二百九十四卷。

晉安帝時、天竺沙門鳩摩羅什以偽秦姚興弘始三年至長安、於大寺及逍遙園譯出。

『出三藏記集』卷二新集異出經錄（大正五五、一四上）

法華經（舊錄有薩芸分陀利經、云是異出法華、未詳誰出、今闕。此經、竺法護出正法華經十卷、鳩摩羅什出新妙法蓮華經七卷）。右一經、三人出、其一經失譯人名、已入失源錄。

現行の鳩摩羅什譯『妙法蓮華經』は八卷二十八品であるが、翻譯當時は七卷二十七品であった。脱落していた提婆達多品と普門品末尾の偈が後に翻譯され追加された。

・沙門鳩摩羅什……還忘前言

『高僧傳』卷二譯經篇晉長安鳩摩羅什傳（大正五〇、三三〇上）

鳩摩羅什、此云童壽、天竺人也。家世國相、什祖父達多、倜儻不群、名重於國。父鳩摩炎、聰明有懿節、將嗣相位、乃辭避出家、東度葱嶺。龜茲王聞其棄榮、甚敬慕之、自出郊迎、請爲國師。王有妹、年始二十、識悟明敏、過目必能、一聞則誦、且體有赤驥、法生智子。諸國娉之、並不肯行。及見摩炎、心欲當之、乃逼以妻焉、既而懷什。什在胎時、其母自覺神悟超解、有倍常日。聞雀梨大寺名德既多、又有得道之僧、即與王族貴女德行諸尼彌日設供、請齋聽法。什母忽自通天竺語、難問之辭必

窮淵致。衆咸歎之。有羅漢達摩瞿沙曰、此必懷智子。爲說舍利弗在胎之證。及什生之後、還忘前言。

『高僧傳』鳩摩羅什傳はそれに先立つ『出三藏記集』卷十四鳩摩羅什傳（大正五五、一〇〇上）を踏まえるが、『弘贊』は『高僧傳』に基づく。

・東度葱嶺

インド側から東に向かってパミール高原を越え、中國側に移動したということ。第二條「蘊在葱外」の注を参照。

・龜茲

第二條「龜茲居士帛元信」の注を参照。

・慧解

『出三藏記集』卷十五慧遠法師傳（大正五五、一〇九中）
遠藉慧解於前因、資勝心於曠劫、故能神明英越、機鑿遐深。

・雀梨大寺

雀離、昭（照）怙釐とも表記される。現在の新疆ウイグル自治區庫車（クチャ）の北北東約二十キロの蘇巴什（スバシ）故城の佛寺遺跡のこととされている。

酈道元『水經注』卷二河水

釋氏西域記曰、國北四十里、山上有寺、名雀離大清淨。又出山東南流、水左派焉。又東南、水流三分、右二水俱東南流、注北河。東川水出龜茲東北、歷赤沙積梨南流、枝水右出、西南入龜茲城、音屈茨也、故延城矣。

『大唐西域記』卷一屈支國（大正五一、八七〇中）

荒城北四十餘里、接山阿隔一河水有二伽藍、同名照怙釐、而東西隨稱。佛像莊飾、殆越人工、僧徒清齋、誠爲勤勵。東照怙釐佛堂中有玉石面、廣二尺餘、色帶黃白、狀如海蛤。其上有佛足履之迹、長尺有八寸、廣餘六寸矣。或有齋日照燭光明。

・得道

『出三藏記集』卷五慧叡喩疑（大正五五、四一下）

優劣存乎人、深淺在其悟。任分而行、無所臧否、前五百年也。此五百年中、得道者多、不得者少。以多言之、故曰正法。後五百年、唯相是非、執競盈路、得道者少、不得者多。亦以多目之、名爲像法。

・淵致

『出三藏記集』卷八僧叡大品經序（大正五五、五三上）

究摩羅什法師慧心夙悟、超拔特詣……以弘始三年歲次星紀冬十二月二十日至長安、秦王扣其虛關、匠伯陶其淵致、虛關既闢、乃正此文言、淵致既宣、而出其釋論。

・達摩瞿沙

『出三藏記集』『高僧傳』は「達摩」とするが特に改めない。この鳩摩羅什の母に関する逸話以外には名を見出せなかった。

・舍利弗在胎之證

母親の舍利が後に釋迦の智惠第一の弟子となる舍利弗を妊娠していた時に、お腹の子のお陰で聰明になり議論が得意になったことを指す。

鳩摩羅什譯『大智度論』卷十一釋初品中舍利弗因緣第十六（大正二五、一三七下）
舍利懷妊、以其子故、母亦聰明、大能論議。其弟拘鄰羅與姊談論、每屈不如、知所懷子必大智慧、未生如是、何況出生。……其父思惟我名提舍、逐我名字、字爲憂波提舍、是爲父母作字。衆人以其舍利所生、皆共名之爲舍利弗。復次舍利弗世世本願於釋迦文尼佛所作智慧第一弟子、字舍利弗是爲本願因緣名字、以是故名舍利弗。問曰、若爾者何以不言憂波提舍、而但言舍利弗。答曰、時人貴重其母、於衆女人中聰明第一、以是因緣故稱舍利弗。

・頃之、什母樂欲……學得初果

『高僧傳』卷二譯經篇晉長安鳩摩羅什傳（大正五〇、三三〇上～中）

頃之、什母樂欲出家、夫未之許、遂更產一男、名弗沙提婆。後因出城遊、觀見塚間枯骨異處縱橫、於是深惟苦本、定誓出家。若不落髮、不咽飲食、至六日夜、氣力綿乏、疑不達旦。夫乃懼而許焉。以未剃髮、故猶不嘗進、即救人除髮、乃下飲食。次日受戒、仍樂禪法。專精匪懈、學得初果。

・初果

須陀洹果、預流果とも呼び、聲聞乘において阿羅漢に到る四段階のうち第一段階を指す。

求那跋陀羅譯『雜阿含經』卷四十一（大正二、二九九上）

爾時世尊告諸比丘、有四沙門果。何等爲四。謂須陀洹果、斯陀含果、阿那含果、阿羅漢果。何等爲須陀洹果。謂三結斷是名須陀洹果。

慧學等譯『賢愚經』卷十三汪水中虫品（大正四、四四四上）

時諸比丘依慕住止、遵善行道、懃修不懈、悉具初果乃至四果、無有凡夫。

・ 什年七歳……尋與母別

出家から母親と別れるまでの間、罽賓（インド西北部）で槃頭達多に『雜藏』『中阿含』『長阿含』を學び、十二歳で龜茲（クチャ）に一度戻ってから、沙勒（カシュガル）で『阿毘曇』や、『圍陀含多論』等の婆羅門教のヴェーダや諸々の學術を學び、更に須利耶蘇摩から『阿耨達經』の教えを受け、『中論』『百論』『十二門論』を學び、温宿（アクス）を経て龜茲に戻り、二十歳になると卑摩羅叉に『十誦律』を學んだ。

『高僧傳』卷二譯經篇晉長安鳩摩羅什傳（大正五〇、三三〇中～三三一上）

什年七歳、亦俱出家。從師受經、日誦千偈、偈有三十二字、凡三萬二千言。誦毘曇既過、師授其義、即自通達、無幽不暢。時龜茲國人以其母王妹利養甚多、乃携什避之。什年九歳、隨母渡辛頭河至罽賓、遇名德法師槃頭達多、即罽賓王之從弟也。……什至即崇以師禮、從受雜藏、中・長二含、凡四百萬言。……至年十二、其母携還龜茲、諸國皆聘以重爵、什並不顧。……遂停沙勒一年、其冬誦阿毘曇、於十門修智諸品無所詔受、而備達其妙、又於六足諸問無所滯礙。沙勒國有三藏沙門名喜見、謂其王曰此沙彌不可輕、王宜請令初開法門。……王許焉、即設大會、請什升座說轉法輪經。龜茲王果遣重使、酬其親好。什以說法之暇乃尋訪外道經書、善學圍陀含多論、多明文辭製作問答等事、又博覽四圍陀典及五明諸論、陰陽星算莫不必盡、妙達吉凶、言若符契。……時有莎車王子、參軍王子兄弟二人、委國請從而爲沙門。兄字須利耶跋陀、弟字須耶利蘇摩。蘇摩才伎絕倫、專以大乘爲化。其兄及諸學者皆共師焉、什亦宗而奉之、親好彌至。蘇摩後爲什說阿耨達經。……於是研覈大小、往復移時、什方知理有所歸、遂專務方等、乃歎曰、吾昔學小乘、如人不識金、以鋁石爲妙。因廣求義要、受誦中・百二論及十二門等。頃之、隨母進到温宿國、即龜茲之北界。……龜茲王躬往温宿、迎什還國。廣說諸經、四遠宗仰、莫之能抗。……至年二十、受戒於王宮、從卑摩羅叉學十誦律。有頃、什母辭往天竺、謂龜茲王白純曰、汝國尋衰、吾其去矣。行至天竺、進登三果。什母臨去謂什曰、方等深教應大闡眞丹。傳之東土、唯爾之力。但於自身無利、其可如何。什曰、大士之道、利彼忘軀、若必使大化流傳、能洗悟矇俗、雖復身當爐鑊苦而無恨。於是留住龜茲、止于新寺。

・ 偈有三十二字

『出三藏記集』卷十僧叡大智釋論序（大正五五、七五上）

論之略本有十萬偈、偈有三十二字、并三百二十萬言。胡夏既乖、又有煩簡之異、三分除二、得此百卷。

・ 一聞能受

『出三藏記集』卷十三安世高傳（大正五五、九五上）

世高才悟幾敏、一聞能達。至止未久、即通習華語。

・盡其隅奧

『論語』述而

子曰、不憤不啓、不悱不發、舉一隅、不以三隅反、則不復也。

法藏『華嚴經傳記』卷二魏中天竺勒那摩提（大正五一、一五八下）

初意神理標異、慧悟絕倫、領牒魏詞、遍盡隅奧。

・眞丹

『歷代三寶紀』卷四譯經後漢錄支婁迦讖（大正四九、五三中）

彼五天目此東國、總言脂那、或云眞丹、或作震旦、此蓋取聲有楚夏耳。

『出三藏記集』卷八涼州釋道朗大涅槃經序（大正五五、五九下）

微言興詠於眞丹、高韻初唱于赤縣、梵音震響於輿俗、眞容巨曜於今日。

・苻堅建元……譯出此經

『高僧傳』卷二譯經篇晉長安鳩摩羅什（大正五〇、三三一中～三三二中）

什既道流西域、名被東川。時苻堅僭號關中、有外國前部王及龜茲王弟竝來朝堅。堅引見、二王說堅云、西域多產珍奇、請兵往定、以求內附。至苻堅建元十三年歲次丁丑正月、太史奏云、有星見於外國分野、當有大德智人入輔中國。堅曰、朕聞西域有鳩摩羅什、襄陽有沙門釋道安、將非此耶。即遣使求之。至十七年二月、善善王、前部王等又說堅請兵西伐。十八年九月、堅遣驍騎將軍呂光、陵江將軍姜飛、將前部王及車師王等、率兵七萬、西伐龜茲及烏耆諸國。……光遂破龜茲殺純、立純弟震爲主。……至涼州聞苻堅已爲姚萇所害、光三軍縞素大臨城南、於是竊號關外、稱年太安。……什停涼積年、呂光父子既不弘道、故蘊其深解、無所宣化。苻堅已亡、竟不相見。及姚萇僭有關中、亦挹其高名、虛心要請。諸呂以什智計多解、恐爲姚謀、不許東入。及萇卒、子興襲位、復遣敦請。興弘始三年三月、有樹連理生于廣庭、逍遙園葱變爲[くさかんむり+丨+臣]、以爲美瑞、謂智人應入。至五月、興遣隴西公碩德西伐呂隆、隆軍大破。至九月、隆上表歸降、方得迎什入關。以其年十二月二十日至于長安。興待以國師之禮、甚見優寵。晤言相對、則淹留終日、研微造盡、則窮年忘劬。自大法東被始于漢明、涉歷魏晉、經論漸多、而支竺所出多滯文格義。興少達崇三寶銳志講集。什既至止、仍請入西明閣及逍遙園譯出衆經。什既率多諳誦、無不究盡、轉能漢言、音譯流便。既覽舊經義多紕僻、皆由先度失旨、不與梵本相應。於是興使沙門增碧、僧遷、法欽、道流、道恒、道標、僧叡、僧肇等八百餘人諮受什旨、更令出大品。什持梵本、興執舊經、以相讎校。其新文異舊者、義皆圓通。衆心快伏、莫不欣讚。……大將軍常山公顯・左軍將軍安城侯嵩竝篤信緣業、屢請什於長

安大寺講說新經、續出小品、金剛、波若、十住、法華、維摩、思益、首楞嚴……中、百、十二門論凡三百餘卷、竝暢顯神源、揮發幽致。于時四方義士萬里必集、盛業久大、于今咸仰。

・太史奏云、有星見外國分野

太史は天文を掌り天文現象によって吉凶を判定する。分野とは、天地は相關關係を持つと考え、天球の區分に對應する地上の區分を言う。

『宋書』卷三十九百官志上

太史令一人、丞一人。掌三辰時日祥瑞妖災、歲終則奏新曆。太史、三代舊官、周世掌建邦之六典、正歲年、以序事頒朔于邦國。又有馮相氏、掌天文次序、保章氏、掌天文。今之太史則并周之太史、馮相、保章三職也。

『周禮』春官保章氏

保章氏掌天星以志星辰日月之變動、以觀天下之遷、辨其吉凶、以星土辨九州之地所封、封域皆有分星、以觀妖祥。

鄭玄注云、星土、星所主土也。封猶界也。……今其存可言者、十二次之分也。星紀吳越也、玄枵齊也、娵訾衛也、降婁魯也、大梁趙也、實沈晉也、鶉首秦也、鶉火周也、鶉尾楚也、壽星鄭也、大火宋也、析木燕也。此分野之妖祥主用客星彗孛之氣爲象。

・悟言

『毛詩』陳風東門之池

東門之池、可以漚菅。彼美淑姬、可與晤言。

『晉書』卷八十王羲之傳引蘭亭序

夫人之相與、俯仰一世、或取諸懷抱、悟言一室之內、或因寄所託、放浪形骸之外。

・研微

『晉書』卷九十一儒林傳虞喜

咸康初、內史何充上疏曰……伏見前賢良虞喜天挺貞素……鑽堅研微有弗及之勤、處靜味道無風塵之志。

・造盡

『出三藏記集』卷八僧叡大品經序（大正五五、五二下～五三上）

摩訶般若波羅蜜者、出八地之由路、登十階之龍津也。夫淵府不足以盡其深美、故寄大以目之。水鏡未可以喻其澄朗、故假慧以稱之。造盡不足以得其崖極、故借度以明之。

・忘倦

『後漢書』傳十四馬援傳

閑於進對、尤善述前世行事。每言及三輔長者、下至閭里少年、皆可觀聽。自皇太子、諸王侍聞者、莫不屬耳忘倦。

・大法東被始於漢明

袁宏『後漢紀』卷十明帝紀上

(楚王)英好游俠、交通賓客、晚節喜黃老、修浮屠祠。……浮屠者、佛也。西域天竺有佛道焉。佛者、漢言覺、將悟羣生也。其教以修善慈心爲主、不殺生、專務清淨、其精者號爲沙門。沙門者、漢言息也、蓋息意去欲、而歸於無爲也。又以爲人死、精神不滅、隨復受形、生時所行善惡皆有報應、故所貴行善修道、以鍊精神而不已、以至無生、而得爲佛也。佛身長一丈六尺、黃金色項中佩日月光、變化無方、無所不入、故能化通萬物、而大濟羣生。初帝夢見金人長大、項有日月光、以問羣臣。或曰、西方有神、其名曰佛、其形長大。陛下所夢、得無是乎。於是遣使天竺、問其道術、遂於中國而圖其形像焉。有經數千萬、以虛無爲宗、苞羅精麤、無所不統、善爲宏闊勝大之言、所求在一體之內、而所明在視聽之外、世俗之人以爲虛誕、然歸於玄微、深遠難得而測。故王公大人觀死生報應之際、莫不矍然自失。

・支竺所出多滯文格義

『出三藏記集』卷十三支謙傳(大正五五、九七中～下)

支謙、字恭明、一名越、大月支人也。祖父法度、以漢靈帝世率國人數百歸化、拜率善中郎將。……十歲學書、同時學者皆伏其聰敏。十三學胡書、備通六國語。初桓靈世、支謙譯出法典、有支亮、紀明資學於謙。謙又受業於亮、博覽經籍、莫不究練、世間藝術多所綜習。……獻帝之末、漢室大亂、與鄉人數十共奔於吳。……後吳主孫權聞其博學有才慧、即召見之、因問經中深隱之義。應機釋難、無疑不析。權大悅、拜爲博士、使輔導東宮、甚加寵秩。越以大教雖行、而經多胡文、莫有解者、既善華戎之語、乃收集衆本、譯爲漢言。從黃武元年、至建興中、所出維摩詰、大般泥洹、法句、瑞應本起等二十七經、曲得聖義、辭旨文雅。又依無量壽、中本起經製讚菩薩連句梵唄三契、注了本生死經、皆行於世。

『出三藏記集』卷八僧肇維摩詰經序(大正五五、五八中)

大秦天王、俊神超世、玄心獨悟……每尋翫茲典、以爲栖神之宅、而恨支竺所出理滯於文、常懼玄宗墜於譯人。北天之運、運通有在也。以弘始八年歲次鶉火……於常安大寺請羅什法師重譯正本。

『高僧傳』卷七義解篇宋京師龍光寺竺道生傳(大正五〇、三六六下)

自經典東流、譯人重阻、多守滯文、鮮見圓義。若忘筌取魚、始可與言道矣。

『出三藏記集』卷二新集異出經錄（大正五五、一三下）

出經之士才趣各殊、辭有質文、意或詳略、故令本一末二、新舊參差。若國言訛轉、則音字楚夏、譯辭格礙、則事義胡越。

竺法護については第二條「正法華經十卷 及び 竺曇摩羅刹」の注を参照。

・鋭志

『漢書』卷二十二禮樂志

上方征討四夷、鋭志武功、不暇留意禮文之事。

・逍遙園

『太平御覽』卷九百六獸部麋引戴延之西征記

徽音殿西南、姚興起波若臺、有逍遙園。西去三百步有鹿子苑、堯王養麋鹿數百頭。

・率多

『史記』卷七十五孟嘗君列傳論

吾嘗過薛、其俗閭里率多暴桀子弟、與鄒魯殊。

・流便

『出三藏記集』卷十三（大正五五、九六上）

次有康孟詳者、其先康居人也、譯出中本起。安公稱、孟詳出經、奕奕流便、足騰玄趣。

・紕僻

『論語』子路

名不正則言不順、言不順則事不成。

皇侃義疏云、云名不正則言不順者……且夫名以召實、實以應名、名若倒錯不正、則當言語紕僻、不得順序也。

・失旨

『出三藏記集』卷九道慈中阿鈴經序（大正五五、六三下）

此諸經律凡百餘萬言、並違本失旨、名不當實、依悖屬辭、句味亦差。良由譯人造次、未善晉言、故使爾耳。

・興使沙門……諮受什旨

鳩摩羅什に師事させた上で、『摩訶般若波羅蜜經』等の經典翻譯に携わらせ、また姚興自身も譯場に參加し、舊譯との比較検討等を行った。

『出三藏記集』卷八僧叡小品經序（大正五五、五三中）

以弘始五年歲在癸卯四月二十三日、於京城之北道遙園中出此經。法師手執胡本、口宣秦言、兩釋異音、交辯文旨。秦王躬攬舊經、驗其得失、諮其通途、坦其宗致、與諸宿舊義業沙門釋慧恭、僧碧、僧遷、寶度、慧精、法欽、道流、僧叡、道恢、道[標+寸]、道恒、道惊等五百餘人詳其義旨、審其文中、然後書之。

・僧碧、僧遷、法欽

姚興に重用され、増加する僧尼を管理するために、僧碧は僧正、僧遷は悦衆、法欽は僧録に任ぜられた。

『高僧傳』卷六義解篇晉長安大寺釋僧碧傳（大正五〇、三六三上～中）

釋僧碧、姓傅氏、北地泥陽人、晉河間郎中令遐之元子也。少出家、止長安大寺、爲弘覺法師弟子。……姚萇、姚興早挹風名、素所知重、及僭有關中、深相頂敬。興既崇信三寶、盛弘大化、建會設齋、烟蓋重疊、使夫慕道捨俗者、十室其半。自童壽入關、遠僧復集、僧尼既多、或有愆漏。……因下書曰、大法東遷、於今爲盛、僧尼已多、應須綱領、宣遠遠規、以濟頽緒。僧碧法師學優早年、德芳芬齒、可爲國內僧主。僧遷法師禪慧兼修、即爲悅衆。法欽、慧斌共掌僧録。給車輿吏力。碧資侍中秩、傳詔、羊車各二人、遷等並有厚給。共事純儉、允愜時望、五衆肅清、六時無怠。至弘始七年、敕加親信、伏身、白從各三十人。僧正之興、碧之始也。

・道流

『高僧傳』卷六義解篇晉吳臺寺釋道祖傳（大正五〇、三六三上）にも僧遷と道流の名が見えるが、彼らは道祖と廬山に入山して七年で受戒し、その後二人とも二十八歳で亡くなったとされているため、本條の僧遷、道流とは別人の可能性が高いだろう。

・道恒、道標

『高僧傳』卷六義解篇晉長安釋道恒傳及附傳道標（大正五〇、三六四中～三六五上）

釋道恒、藍田人。……至年二十、後母又亡、行喪盡禮、服畢出家。游刃佛理、多所兼通、學該内外、才思清敏。羅什入關、即往修造、什大嘉之、及譯出衆經、並助詳定。時恒有同學道標、亦雅有才力、當時擅名、與恒相次。秦主姚興以恒標二人神氣俊朗、有經國之量、乃敕僞尚書令姚顯、令敦逼恒標遷道助振王業。……恒標等答曰……恒等才質闕短、染法未深、縉服之下、誓畢身命、並習佛法、不閑世事。徒廢非常之業、終無殊異之功。……興又致書於什碧二法師曰……近詔恒標二人、令釋羅漢之服、尋大士之蹤。然道無不在。願法師等昂以喻之。什碧等答曰……今恒標等德非圓達、分在守節、少習玄化、伏膺佛道。……願陛下施既往之恩、縱其微志也。興後頗復下書、闔境救之、殆而得免。

姚興からの還俗の要請を巡ってやりとりされた書簡は『弘明集』卷十一に収められている。

・僧叡

『高僧傳』卷六義解篇晉長安釋僧叡傳（大正五〇、三六四上～中）

釋僧叡、魏郡長樂人也。少樂出家、至年十八始獲從志、依投僧賢法師爲弟子。謙虛內敏、學與時競。至年二十二、博通經論。……至年二十四、遊歷名邦、處處講說、知音之士負袞成群。常歎曰、經法雖少、足識因果、禪法未傳、厝心無地。什後至關、因請出禪法要三卷。……叡既獲之、日夜修習、遂精鍊五門、善入六淨。僞司徒公姚嵩深相禮貴、姚興問嵩、叡公何如。嵩答、實鄴衛之松栢。興敕見之。公卿皆集、欲觀其才器。叡風韻滄流、含吐彬蔚。興大賞悅、即敕給俸卹吏力人輿。興後謂嵩曰、乃四海標領、何獨鄴衛之松栢。於是美聲遐布、遠近歸德。什所翻經、叡並參正。昔竺法護出正法華經、受決品云、天見人、人見天。什譯經至此乃言、此語與西域義同、但在言過質。叡曰、將非人天交接、兩得相見。什喜曰、實然。其領悟標出、皆此類也。……什歎曰、吾傳譯經論、得與子相值、眞無所恨矣。著大智論、十二門論、中論等諸序、并著大、小品、法華、維摩、思益、自在王、禪經等序、皆傳於世。

僧叡による經論の序は『出三藏記集』卷八～十一に収められている。

・僧肇

『高僧傳』卷六義解篇晉長安釋僧肇傳（大正五〇、三六五上～下）

釋僧肇、京兆人。家貧、以傭書爲業、遂因繕寫、乃歷觀經史、備盡墳籍。愛好玄微、每以莊老爲心要、嘗讀老子德章、乃歎曰、美則美矣、然期神冥累之方、猶未盡善也。後見舊維摩經、歡喜頂受、披尋翫味、乃言、始知所歸矣、因此出家。學善方等、兼通三藏、及在冠年、而名振關輔。……後羅什至姑臧、肇自遠從之、什嗟賞無極。及什適長安、肇亦隨返。姚興命肇與僧叡等、入逍遙園助詳定經論。肇以去聖久遠、文義多雜、先舊所解、時有乖謬。及見什諮稟、所悟更多。因出小品之後、肇便著波若無知論凡二千餘言、竟以呈什、什讀之稱善、乃謂肇曰、吾解不謝子、辭當相挹。時廬山隱士劉遺民見肇此論、乃歎曰、不意方袍復有平叔。因以呈遠公。遠乃撫几歎曰、未常有也。因共披尋翫味、更存往復。……肇後又著不眞空論、物不遷論等、并注維摩、及製諸經論序、並傳於世。及什之亡後、追悼永往、翹思彌厲、乃著涅槃無名論。

「般若無知論」「不眞空論」等の著作は『肇論』にまとめられている。僧肇の手になる序は『出三藏記集』卷八「維摩詰經序」、卷九「長阿含經序」、卷十一「百論序」がある。

・弘始八年……譯出此經

『出三藏記集』卷八慧觀法華宗要序（大正五五、五七中）

秦弘始八年夏、於長安大寺集四方義學沙門二千餘人、更出斯經、與衆詳究。什自手執胡經、口譯秦語、曲從方言、而趣不乖本、即文之益亦已過半。雖復霄雲披翳、陽景俱暉、未足喻也。什猶謂語現而理沈、事近而旨遠、又釋言表之隱、以應探賾之求、雖冥扉未開、固已得其門矣。

・惠叡法師……而得流此

『出三藏記集』卷五慧叡喻疑（大正五五、四一下～四二上）

此大法三門皆有成證。……法華正本於于填大國輝光重壤、踊出空中、而得流此。……如什公所言、是大化三門無極眞體、皆有神驗、無所疑也。

「喻疑」は『法華經』の部分の前後で『放光般若經』の梵本と『大般泥洹經』の寫本が火の中でも燃えなかったという靈驗を記しており、『法華經』についても靈驗の一種として述べているようである。鳩摩羅什の翻譯に用いられた底本がどこで入手されたものかは『高僧傳』卷二鳩摩羅什傳、『出三藏記集』卷八慧觀法華宗要序、僧叡法華經後序には言及がないので、『弘贊』は「喻疑」を引用したのであろう。

・法華正本於于填大國

『法華經傳記』卷一（大正五一、五〇中）

西域志云、昔于闐王宮有法華梵本六千五百偈。

闍那崛多・達摩笈多譯『添品妙法蓮華經』序（大正九、一三四下）

昔燉煌沙門竺法護於晉武之世譯正法華。後秦姚興更請羅什譯妙法蓮華。考驗二譯、定非一本。護似多羅之葉、什似龜茲之文。余檢經藏、備見二本、多羅則與正法符會、龜茲則共妙法允同。

『法華經』梵本と于填（于闐）を関連付ける記述は「喻疑」の他に『法華經傳記』に引く『西域志』に見出せるが、現存の『法華經傳記』は八四四年以降の成立とされており（松森秀幸『法華伝記』の成立年代と「釈志遠伝」の位置づけについて）『印度学仏教学研究』第六八卷第一号、二〇一九、二九九～三〇五頁）、引用された『西域志』の性格も不明である。また『添品』序では鳩摩羅什譯は龜茲（クチャ）本とよく類似するとされている。

・揮光重壤、涌出空中

『文選』卷十八嵇康琴賦

披重壤以誕載兮、參辰極而高驤。

李善注云、披、開也。重壤、謂地也。泉壤稱九、故曰重也。

『妙法蓮華經』卷四見寶塔品（大正九、三二中～下）

爾時佛前有七寶塔、高五百由旬、縱廣二百五十由旬、從地踊出、住在空中。……爾時佛告大樂說菩薩、此寶塔中有如來全身、乃往過去東方無量千萬億阿僧祇世界、國名寶淨、彼中有佛、號曰多寶。其佛行菩薩道時作大誓願、若我成佛、滅度之後、於十方國土、有說法華經處、我之塔廟爲聽是經故踊現其前、爲作證明、讚言善哉。

・司隸校尉……至今流布

『出三藏記集』卷八僧叡法華經後序（大正五五、五七下）

秦司隸校尉左將軍安城侯姚嵩、擬韻玄門、宅心世表、注誠斯典、信詣彌至。每思尋其文、深識譯者之失。既遇究摩羅法師、爲之傳寫、指其大歸、真若披重霄而高蹈、登崐崙而俯眇矣。于時聽受領悟之僧八百餘人、皆是諸方英秀、一時之傑也。是歲弘始八年歲次鶉火。

・司隸校尉左將軍安城侯姚崇

姚崇は姚萇の子、姚興の弟、慕容沖の下で人質とされたことがあり、後仇池の楊盛との戦いにより永和一年（四一六）卒。本條「僧叡」注の『高僧傳』卷六僧叡傳にも名が見えるように、姚興とともに佛教に熱心であった。

『晉書』卷百十六載記姚萇

時慕容沖與苻堅相攻、衆甚盛。萇將西上、恐沖遏之、乃遣使通和、以子崇爲質於沖。

『晉書』卷百十九載記姚泓

仇池公楊盛攻陷祁山、執建節王總、遂逼秦州。泓遣後將軍姚平救之、盛引退。姚嵩與平追盛及于竹嶺、姚讚率隴西太守姚秦都、略陽太守王煥以禁兵赴之。讚至清水、嵩爲盛所敗、嵩及秦都、王煥皆戰死。讚至秦州、退還仇池。

『出三藏記集』卷十五慧遠法師傳（大正五五、一一〇中）

姚略（『高僧傳』卷六義解晉廬山釋慧遠傳は興に作る）欽想風名、嘆其才思、致書慇懃、信餉歲通、贈以龜茲國細鏤雜變石像、以申款心。又令姚嵩獻其珠像。

また鳩摩羅什による『百論』の翻譯にも參與していた（『出三藏記集』卷十一僧肇百論序）。なお『廣弘明集』卷十八法義篇に姚嵩による姚興への表と姚興からの答えが収録されている。

・疑韻

『出三藏記集』卷八僧叡小品經序（大正五五、五五上）

有秦太子者、寓跡儲宮、擬韻區外、翫味斯經、夢想增至、准悟大品、深知譯者之失。

・玄門

『老子』第一章

道可道、非常道。名可名、非常名。……此兩者、同出而異名、同謂之玄。玄之又玄、衆妙之門。

『弘明集』卷五慧遠三報論（大正五二、三四下）

推此以觀、則知有方外之賓、服膺妙法、洗心玄門、一詣之感、超登上位。

・宅心

『尚書』康誥

汝丕遠惟商考成人、宅心知訓。

僞孔傳云、汝當大遠求商家考老成人之道、常以居心、則知訓民。

『弘明集』卷五慧遠答桓玄明報應論（大正五二、三四上）

輕重權於罪福、則銓善惡以宅心。善惡滯於私戀、則推我以通物。

・世表

『晉書』卷五十一皇甫謐傳引釋勸論

子獨栖遲衡門、放形世表、遜遁丘園、不睨華好。

・又杯度比丘……唯舌不灰

『高僧傳』卷二譯經篇晉長安鳩摩羅什傳（大正五〇、三三二下～三三三上）

又杯渡比丘在彭城、聞什在長安、乃歎曰、吾與此子戲別三百餘年、杳然未期、遲有遇於來生耳。什未終日、少覺四大不愈、乃口出三番神呪、令外國弟子誦之以自救、未及致力、轉覺危殆。於是力疾與衆僧告別曰、因法相遇、殊未盡伊心。方復後世、惻愴何言。自以闇昧謬充傳譯、凡所出經論三百餘卷、唯十誦一部未及刪煩、存其本旨、必無差失。願凡所宣譯傳流後世、咸共弘通。今於衆前發誠實誓、若所傳無謬者、當使焚身之後舌不焦爛。以僞秦弘始十一年八月二十日卒于長安。是歲、晉義熙五年也。即於逍遙園依外國法以火焚屍、薪滅形碎、唯舌不灰。後外國沙門來云、羅什所誦十不出一。

・不測人

『弘明集』卷十一何令尚之答宋文皇帝讚揚佛教事（大正五二、六九中）

自邃以上、護蘭諸公、皆將亞迹黃中、或不測人也。

・四大

『弘明集』卷五慧遠答桓玄明報應論（大正五二、三三中）

夫四大之體、即地水火風耳、結而成身、以爲神宅。

・神呪

『高僧傳』卷十二誦經篇宋臨渭釋普明傳（大正五〇、四〇七中）

又善神呪、所救皆愈。有鄉人王道眞妻病、請明來呪。明入門、婦便悶絕。俄見一物如狸、長數尺許、從狗竇出、因此而愈。

・危殆

『荀子』王制

誠以其國爲王者之所亦王、以其國爲危殆滅亡之所亦危殆滅亡。

・力疾

『晉書』卷四十七傳祗傳

祗以暴疾薨、時年六十九。祗自以義誠不終、力疾手筆敕厲其二子宣、暢、辭旨深切、覽者莫不感激慷慨。

・後世

『高僧傳』卷二譯經篇晉長安鳩摩羅什傳（大正五〇、三三二下）

姚主常謂什曰、大師聰明超悟、天下莫二、若一旦後世、何可使法種無嗣。

・惻愴

荀悅『前漢紀』卷八孝文皇帝紀下十四年

夫賈誼過湘水、弔屈原、惻愴慟懷、豈徒忿怨而已哉。

・焚身之後、舌不焦爛

『大智度論』卷九初品中放光釋論之餘（大正二五、一二七上）

復有一國、有一比丘、誦阿彌陀佛經及摩訶般若波羅蜜。是人欲死時、語弟子言、阿彌陀佛與彼大衆俱來。即時動身自歸、須臾命終。命終之後、弟子積薪燒之。明日灰中見舌不燒。誦阿彌陀佛經、故見佛自來。誦般若波羅蜜、故舌不可燒。此皆今世現事。如經中說、諸佛菩薩來者甚多、如是處處有人罪垢結薄、一心念佛、信淨不疑、必得見佛、終不虛也。以是諸因緣、故知實有十方佛。

六、宋涼※州釋智嚴（劉宋の涼州の釋智嚴）

【原文】

法花三昧經一卷。

右※。沙門智嚴、西涼州人。弱冠出家、便以精勤著名、衲衣宴坐、蔬食永歲。每欲博事名師、廣求經誥※。遂周流西國、進到罽賓、入摩天陀羅精舍、從佛馱先比丘、諮受禪法。漸染三年、功踰十載。佛馱先見其禪思有緒、特深器異。彼諸道俗聞而歎曰、秦地乃有求道沙門矣。始不輕秦類、敬接遠人。時有佛馱跋陀比丘、亦是彼國禪匠。嚴乃要請東歸、欲傳法中土。跋陀嘉其懇至、遂共東行。於是踰越沙險、達于關中。常依隨※跋陀、止長安大寺。頃之、跋陀橫爲秦僧所擯、嚴亦分散、憩于山東精舍、坐禪誦經、力精修學。義熙十三年、宋武帝西伐長安、剋捷※旋旆、途出山東。時始興公王恢從駕、遊觀山川、至嚴精舍、見其同止三僧各坐繩床、禪思湛然。恢至、良久不覺、於是彈指、三人開眼、俄而還閉、不與交言。恢心驚其奇、訪諸耆老、皆云、此三僧隱居求志、高潔法師也。恢即啓宋武、延請還都、莫肯行者。既屢請慊至、二人推嚴隨行。恢道懷素篤、禮事甚殷。還都、即住始興寺。嚴性虛靖、志避諠塵、恢乃爲於東郊之際更起精舍、即枳園寺也。嚴前還於西域、所得衆經、未及譯寫、到元嘉四年、乃共沙門寶雲譯出前經。嚴清素寡欲、隨受隨施、少而遊方、无所滯著。稟性冲退、不自陳叙、故雖多美行、世无得而盡傳。嚴昔未出家時、嘗受五戒、有所虧犯。後入道受具足、常疑不得戒、每以爲懼。積年禪觀、而不能自了、遂更汎海、重到天竺、諮諸明達。遇羅漢比丘、具以事問、羅漢不決、乃爲嚴入定、往兜率宮、諮啓彌勒。彌勒答云、得戒。嚴大喜躍、於是步歸、行至罽賓、无疾而化、時年七十八。彼國法、凡聖燒身各處。嚴雖戒操高明、而實行未辯。始移尸向凡僧墓地、而尸重不起。改向聖墓、即飄然自輕。嚴弟子智羽、智遠故從西來、報此徵瑞、俱還外國。以此※推、嚴信是得道人也。

【校勘】

この條は【注釋】に挙げた『高僧傳』卷三譯經宋京師枳園寺釋智嚴傳、『歷代三寶紀』卷十譯經宋世錄に基づくであろう。

「涼」 底本「滌」に作る。本文冒頭、及び『高僧傳』に従い改める。

「右」 大正藏は下に「涉法」あり、大正藏校勘記甲本はなし。底本は右側「ヒ」で削除を示している。

「誥」 大正藏は「詰」に誤る。

「隨」 底本「隋」に作る。大正藏は「隨」とする。『高僧傳』に従い改める。

「捷」 大正藏は「捷」とし、大正藏校勘記甲本は「徙カ」とする。底本の字形は「捷」とも見なしうる範囲内と考える。

「此」 大正藏は「比」に誤る。

【現代日本語譯】

『法花三昧經』一卷。

右。沙門の智嚴は、西の涼州の人である。二十歳の頃に出家すると、一心に勵む態度で名を馳せ、僧衣をまとめて坐禪し、長きにわたって菜食をした。常日頃から様々な名僧に師事して、幅廣く經典を探し求めたいと望んでいた。そこで西方の國々を巡り歩き、罽賓までやって来て、摩天陀羅精舎に入り、佛馱先比丘に師事し、禪法の教えを受けた。次第に佛法に教化されること三年、その成果は十年分を超えるほどであった。佛馱先は彼が禪定で見込みがあるのを見て、特に懇ろに重んじた。彼の地の僧侶や俗人たちはそれを聞いて「秦の地にもなんと求道の沙門がいたのだな」と感歎し、始めて秦の人を見くびらず、遠方の人に恭しく接するようになった。その頃佛馱跋陀比丘がおり、やはりかの國の禪の名匠であった。そこで智嚴は東へと赴くよう要請し、佛法を中國の地に伝えようとした。佛馱跋陀は彼の切なる願いを喜び、一緒に東へ行くことにした。そうして砂漠と険しい道のりを越え、關中へと到着した。いつも佛馱跋陀にお供して、長安の大寺に住した。暫くすると、佛馱跋陀は謂われなき咎で後秦の僧侶によって追い出されてしまい、智嚴も散り散りに別れて、華山より東にある精舎に落ち着き、坐禪と誦經をして、一心に佛道を學んだ。義熙十三年（四一七）、劉宋の武帝となる劉裕は西に長安を征討し、勝利して凱旋する際、華山より東を通りがかった。その時始興公の王恢は劉裕に随行しており、山川を遊覽して、精舎までやって来たところ、同じく精舎に住する三人の僧が各々繩を張った腰掛けに坐して、ひっそりと禪定に浸っているのを目にした。王恢が来てもずっと目覺めないのので、ぱちんと指を鳴らしてみたら、三人は目を開けたのだが、すぐにまたつぶってしまい、言葉を交わすことはなかった。王恢はその不思議さに驚いて、古老たちに尋ねたところ、口を揃えて「この三人の僧は隱居して自らの志を追求している、高潔な法師だよ」と言った。王恢はすぐさま劉裕に報告し、招請して都に連れ歸ろうとしたのだが、行くのを聞き入れる者はいなかった。繰り返して誠意を込めて頼んだところ、二人が智嚴を随行させるようにと推薦した。王恢はもともと佛道への思いが篤く、智嚴に丁重に禮を盡くした。都に歸ると、すぐに始興寺に住した。智嚴はひっそりと靜かな性格で、喧しい俗世間から遠ざかりたかったため、王恢は彼のために東の郊外にあらためて精舎を建立した。それが枳園寺である。智嚴が前に西域に戻って手に入れた多くの經典は、翻譯書寫しないままであったが、元嘉四年（四二七）になって、沙門の寶雲とともに前に得た經典を譯出した。智嚴は清廉で欲がなく、布施を受ければすぐに施してしまい、若い頃からあちこち渡り歩いて、執着がなかった。生まれつき控え目なため自

分から言いはしなかったので、善行が多かったのだが、世間では全て伝えることは出来なかった。智嚴が昔まだ出家していなかった時、嘗て五戒は受けてから、違反してしまったことがあった。後に佛門に入り具足戒を受けると、戒の本質をその身に得ていないのではないかと常に疑い、いつも心配していた。何年も禪觀を修行したのだが、自分では判別がつかなかったため、あらためて海に船出して、もう一度天竺へと行き、道理に明るい僧に意見を求めることにした。羅漢の比丘に出會ったので、事細かに尋ねたところ、羅漢はどちらとも定められず、そこで智嚴のために禪定に入って兜率天へ行き、彌勒菩薩に質した。彌勒は「戒を得ている」と答えた。智嚴は一方ならず小躍りして喜び、そこで歩いて歸路を辿り、罽賓まで行き着くと、病気にもならないまま遷化した。この時七十八歳であった。あちらの國の法では、凡僧と聖僧は亡骸を焼くのに場所を分けるものである。智嚴は持戒の節操は気高く明瞭であったが、しかし實際の行いについては不明であった。始めに亡骸を移動させて凡僧の墓地へ向かおうとしたら、亡骸は重くて持ち上がらなかった。あらためて聖僧の墓地に向かうと、たちまちふわりと軽くなった。智嚴の弟子の智羽、智遠がわざわざ西からやって来て、この瑞祥を報告し、連れだって外國へと戻って行った。これによって推察するに、智嚴は紛れもなく得道の人である。

【注釋】

・法華三昧經一卷

『出三藏記集』卷四新集續撰失譯雜經錄（大正五五、三〇中～三二上）

法華三昧經一卷。……右八百四十六部、凡八百九十五卷。新集所得、今並有其本、悉在經藏。

『歷代三寶紀』卷十譯經宋世錄（大正四九、八九下）

法華三昧經一卷……右一十四部、合三十六卷。文帝元嘉四年、涼州沙門釋智嚴弱冠出家、遊方博學、遂於西域遇得前經梵本、齎來達到楊都、於柁園寺共寶雲出。嚴之神德備高僧傳、不復委載。

『出三藏記集』卷十五智嚴法師傳や次の注に挙げた『高僧傳』には「法華三昧經一卷」の翻譯に言及がなく、『出三藏記集』には同名同一卷數の失譯の見存本が著録されるのみである。『歷代三寶紀』から智嚴譯に挙げられるようになる。

・沙門智嚴

『高僧傳』卷三譯經篇宋京師柁園寺釋智嚴傳（大正五〇、三三九中～下）

釋智嚴、西涼州人。弱冠出家、便以精勤著名、納衣宴坐、蔬食永歲。每以本城丘墟、志欲博事名師、廣求經誥。遂周流西國、進到罽賓、入摩天陀羅精舍、從佛駄先比丘、諮受禪法。漸深三年、功踰十載。佛駄先見其禪思有緒、特深器異。彼諸道俗

聞而歎曰、秦地乃有求道沙門矣。始不輕秦類、敬接遠人。時有佛馱跋陀羅比丘、亦是彼國禪匠。嚴乃要請東歸、欲傳法中土。跋陀嘉其懇至、遂共東行、於是踰沙越險、達自關中。常依隨跋陀、止長安大寺。頃之、跋陀橫爲秦僧所擯。嚴亦分散、憩于山東精舍。坐禪誦經、力精修學。晉義熙十三年、宋武帝西伐長安、剋捷旋旆、塗出山東。時始興公王恢從駕、遊觀山川、至嚴精舍、見其同止三僧各坐繩床、禪思湛然。恢至、良久不覺、於是彈指、三人開眼、俄而還閉、問不與言。恢心敬其奇、訪諸耆老、皆云、此三僧隱居求志、高潔法師也。恢即啓宋武帝、延請還都、莫肯行者。既屢請懇至、二人推嚴隨行。恢懷道素篤、禮事甚殷。還都、即住始興寺。嚴性愛虛靖、志避諠塵。恢乃爲於東郊之際更起精舍、即枳園寺也。嚴前於西域所得梵本衆經、未及譯寫、到元嘉四年、乃共沙門寶雲譯出普曜、廣博嚴淨、四天王等。嚴在寺不受別請、常分衛自資。道化所被、幽顯咸服。……嚴清素寡欲、隨受隨施、少而遊方、無所滯著。稟性冲退、不自陳叙、故雖多美行、世無得而盡傳。嚴昔未出家時、嘗受五戒、有所虧犯。後入道受具足、常疑不得戒、每以爲懼。積年禪觀、而不能自了、遂更汎海、重到天竺、諮諸明達。值羅漢比丘、具以事問、羅漢不敢判決、乃爲嚴入定、往兜率宮諮彌勒。彌勒答云、得戒。嚴大喜、於是步歸、至罽賓無疾而化、時年七十八。彼國法凡聖燒身各處。嚴雖戒操高明、而實行未辦。始移屍向凡僧墓地、而屍重不起、改向聖墓、則飄然自輕。嚴弟子智羽、智遠故從西來、報此微瑞、俱還外國。以此推、嚴信是得道人也。但未知果向中間若深淺耳。

『高僧傳』智嚴傳はそれに先立つ『出三藏記集』卷十五智嚴法師傳（大正五五、一一二中）を踏まえるが、『弘贊』は『高僧傳』に基づく。なお『出三藏記集』の傳では「不知何許人」、『名僧傳抄』第二十六宋枳園寺釋智嚴傳は「西涼州人」としている。

・涼州

『晉書』卷十四地理志上涼州

涼州、案禹貢雍州之西界、周衰、其地爲狄。秦興美陽甘泉宮、本匈奴鑄金人祭天之處。匈奴既失甘泉、又使休屠、渾邪王等居涼州之地。二王後以地降漢、漢置張掖、酒泉、敦煌、武威郡。其後又置金城郡、謂之河西五郡。漢改周之雍州爲涼州、蓋以地處西方、常寒涼也。地勢西北邪出、在南山之間、南隔西羌、西通西域、于時號爲斷匈奴右臂。獻帝時、涼州數有亂、河西五郡去州隔遠、於是乃別以爲雍州。未又依古典定九州、乃合關右以爲雍州。魏時復分以爲涼州、刺史領戊己校尉、護西域、如漢故事、至晉不改。統郡八、縣四十六、戸三萬七百。……永寧中、張軌爲涼州刺史、鎮武威……是時中原淪沒、元帝徙居江左、軌乃控據河西、稱晉正朔、是爲前涼。……天錫降於苻氏、其地尋爲呂光所據。呂光都於姑臧後、以郭鑿言讖、改昌松

爲東張掖郡。及呂隆降於姚興、其地三分。武昭王爲西涼、建號於敦煌。禿髮烏孤爲南涼、建號於樂都。沮渠蒙遜爲北涼、建號於張掖。而分據河西五郡。

・弱冠

『禮記』曲禮上

二十曰弱、冠。

正義云、二十曰弱冠者、二十成人、初加冠、體猶未壯、故曰弱也。

・經誥

『三國志』卷十六魏書杜恕傳裴松之注引荀綽兗州記

性純篤閑雅、好禮無違、存心經誥、博學洽聞。

・佛馱先比丘

本條の「時有佛馱跋陀……秦僧所擯」注を参照。『高僧傳』卷二佛馱跋陀羅傳では「佛大先」とされる。

・禪思

『弘明集』卷十二廬山慧遠法師與桓玄論料簡沙門書（大正五二、八五中）

經教所開、凡有三科。一者禪思入微、二者諷味遺典、三者興建福業。三科誠異、皆以律行爲本。

・器異

『後漢書』傳十四馬嚴傳

專心墳典、能通春秋左氏、因覽百家羣言、遂交結英賢、京師大人咸器異之。

・時有佛馱跋陀……秦僧所擯

『高僧傳』卷二譯經篇晉京師道場寺佛馱跋陀羅傳（大正五〇、三三四中～三三五中）

佛馱跋陀羅、此云覺賢、本姓釋氏、迦維羅衛人、甘露飯王之苗裔也。祖父達摩提婆、此云法天、嘗商旅於北天竺、因而居焉。……及受具戒、修業精勤、博學群經、多所通達、少以禪律馳名。常與同學僧伽達多共遊罽賓、同處積載。……常欲遊方弘化、備觀風俗。會有秦沙門智嚴、西至罽賓、覩法衆清勝、乃慨然東顧曰、我諸同輩斯有道志、而不遇眞匠、發悟莫由。即諮訊國衆、孰能流化東土、僉云、有佛馱跋陀者、出生天竺那呵利城、族姓相承、世遵道學、其童龕出家、已通解經論、少受業於大禪師佛大先。先時亦在罽賓、乃謂嚴曰、可以振維僧徒、宣授禪法者、佛馱跋陀其

人也。嚴既要請苦至、賢遂愍而許焉。於是捨衆辭師、裹糧東逝。步驟三載、綿歷寒暑、既度葱嶺、路經六國。國主矜其遠化、並傾資奉。至交趾乃附舶。……頃之、至青州東萊郡、聞鳩摩羅什在長安、即往從之。什大欣悅、共論法相、振發玄微、多所悟益。……秦主姚興專志佛法、供養三千餘僧、並往來宮闕、盛修人事。唯賢守靜、不與衆同。後語弟子云、我昨見本鄉有五舶俱發。既而弟子傳告外人、關中舊僧咸以爲顯異惑衆。又賢在長安大弘禪業、四方樂靖者並聞風而至、但染學有淺深、得法有濃淡、澆僞之徒因而詭滑。有一弟子因少觀行、自言、得阿那含果。賢未即檢問、遂致流言、大被謗讀、將有不測之禍。於是徒衆或藏名潛去、或踰牆夜走、半日之中、衆散殆盡。賢乃夷然、不以介意。時舊僧僧碧、道恒等謂賢曰、佛尚不聽說己所得法、先言五舶將至、虛而無實、又門徒誑惑、互起同異、既於律有違、理不同止、宜可時去、勿得停留。賢曰、我身若流萍、去留甚易、但恨懷抱未申、以爲慨然耳。於是與弟子慧觀等四十餘人俱發、神志從容、初無異色。識眞之衆咸共歡惜、白黑送者千有餘人。姚興聞去悵悵、乃謂道恒曰、佛賢沙門協道來遊、欲宣遺教、緘言未吐、良用深慨、豈可以一言之咎令萬夫無導。因敕令追之。賢報使曰、誠知恩旨、無預聞命。於是率侶宵征、南指廬岳。沙門釋慧遠久服風名、聞至欣喜若舊。遠以賢之被擯、過由門人、若懸記五舶、止說在同意、亦於律無犯。乃遣弟子曇邕致書姚主及關中衆僧、解其擯事。遠乃請出禪數諸經。賢志在遊化、居無求安。停止歲許、復西適江陵、遇外國舶至。既而訊訪、果是天竺五舶、先所見者也。

・懇至

『後漢書』傳六十九上儒林楊政

政每共言論、常切磋懇至、不爲屈撓。

・長安大寺

長安の大寺には同時期に鳩摩羅什が住し、譯經や講義が行われた。第五條偽秦天竺釋童壽を参照。

・義熙十三年、宋武帝西伐長安

『晉書』卷十安帝紀義熙十三年

秋七月、劉裕克長安、執姚泓、收其彝器、歸諸京師。

『宋書』卷二武帝紀中義熙十三年

二月、冠軍將軍檀道濟等次潼關。三月庚辰、大軍入河。索虜步騎十萬、營據河津。公命諸軍濟河擊破之。公至洛陽。七月、至陝城。龍驤將軍王鎮惡伐木爲舟、自河浮渭。八月、扶風太守沈田子大破姚泓於藍田。王鎮惡剋長安、生擒泓。九月、公至長

安。長安豐全、帑藏盈積。公先收其彝器、渾儀、土圭之屬、獻于京師。其餘珍寶珠玉、以班賜將帥。執送姚泓、斬于建康市。謁漢高帝陵、大會文武於未央殿。

・剋捷

『宋書』卷一武帝紀上義熙四年

敕季高曰、大軍十二月之交、必破妖虜。卿今時當至廣州、傾其巢窟、令賊奔走之日、無所歸投。季高受命而行、如期剋捷。

・旋旆

『文選』卷四十四陳琳檄吳將校部曲文

故且觀兵旋旆、復整六師、長驅西征、致天下誅。

・始興公王恢

王導が太寧二年（三二四）に始興郡公に封ぜられ、その玄孫に當たるのが王恢である。

『晉書』卷六明帝紀太寧二年

封司徒王導爲始興郡公、邑三千戶、賜絹九千匹。

『晉書』卷六十五王導傳

導六子、悅、恬、洽、協、劭、蒼。……悅無子、以弟恬子琨爲嗣、襲導爵丹楊尹、卒、贈太常。子嘏嗣、尚鄱陽公主、歷中領軍、尚書。卒、子恢嗣、義熙末、爲游擊將軍。

・彈指

『妙法蓮華經』卷六如來神力品（大正九、五一下）

釋迦牟尼佛及寶樹下諸佛現神力時、滿百千歲、然後還攝舌相、一時警欬、俱共彈指、是二音聲、遍至十方諸佛世界、地皆六種震動。

・隱居求志

『論語』季氏

孔子曰、見善如不及、見不善如探湯。吾見其人矣、吾聞其語矣。隱居以求其志、行義以達其道。吾聞其語矣、未見其人也。

・始興寺 及び 枳園寺

『廣弘明集』卷十六沈約南齊僕射王奐枳園寺刹下石記（大正五二、二一一上）

佛教東流、適未尤著、始自洛京、盛於江左。晉故車騎將軍琅耶王劭、玄悟獨曉、信解淵微、於太祖文獻公清廟之北造枳園精舍。其始則芳枳樹籬、故名因事立。

沈約によると枳園寺は王導の五男である王劭が王導の廟の北に建立したものであり、また『南朝佛寺志』卷上晉枳園寺の條の陳作霖の按語は枳園寺の位置を「當今明故宮之東南」とし、かつ「案高僧傳所謂住始興寺、蓋即文獻公廟也。文獻爲始興公、謂廟爲寺。六朝往往有之」と述べ、廟の方が始興寺であった見なす。

・虚靖

『晉書』卷九十四隱逸傳索襲

索襲字偉祖、敦煌人也。虚靖好學、不應州郡之命、舉孝廉、賢良方正、皆以疾辭。

・沙門寶雲

『出三藏記集』卷十五寶雲法師傳（大正五五、一一三上～中）

釋寶雲、未詳其氏、族傳云、涼州人也。弱年出家、精勤有學行……誓欲躬覩靈跡、廣尋群經、遂以晉隆安之初、遠適西域、與法顯、智嚴先後相隨。涉履流沙、登踰雪嶺、勤苦艱危、不以爲難。遂歷于闐天竺諸國、備覩靈異、乃經羅刹之野、聞天鼓之音、釋迦影跡多所瞻禮。雲在外域遍學胡書、天竺諸國音字詰訓悉皆貫練。後還長安、隨禪師佛馱跋陀受業、修道禪諷、孜孜不怠。俄而禪師橫爲秦僧所擯、徒衆悉同其咎、雲亦奔散。會廬山釋慧遠解其擯事、共歸京師、安止道場寺。……雲譯出新無量壽。晚出諸經、多雲所譯。常手執胡本、口宣晉語、華戎兼通、音訓允正。雲之所定、衆咸信服。初關中沙門竺佛念、善於宣譯、於符姚二世顯出衆經。江左練梵、莫踰於雲、故於晉宋之際弘通法藏、沙門慧觀等咸友而善之。雲性好幽居、以保閑寂、遂適六合山寺、譯出佛所行讚經。……頃之、道場慧觀臨卒、請雲還都、總理寺任。雲不得已而還居。歲餘復還六合。以元嘉二十六年卒、春秋七十餘。其所造外國、別有記傳。徵士豫章雷次宗爲其傳序。

・冲退

『晉書』卷五十四陸喜傳引西州清論較論格品篇

避尊居卑、祿代耕養、玄靜守約、冲退澹然、此第二人也。

・虧犯

『宋書』卷六十四何承天傳

謹尋事原心、嘉母辭自求質錢、爲子還責。嘉雖虧犯教義、而熊無請殺之辭。熊求所以生之而今殺之、非隨所求之謂。

・禪觀

『出三藏記集』卷六道安陰持入經序（大正五五、四四下）

有捨家開士、出自安息、字世高。大慈流洽、播化斯土、譯梵爲晉、微顯闡幽、其所敷宣、專務禪觀、醇玄道數、深矣遠矣、是經其所出也。

・乃爲嚴入定……答云、得戒

『高僧傳』卷十一習禪篇宋京師中興寺釋慧覽傳（大正五〇、三九九上）

釋慧覽、姓成、酒泉人。少與玄高俱以寂觀見稱。覽曾遊西域、頂戴佛鉢、仍於罽賓從達摩比丘諮受禪要。達摩曾入定、往兜率天、從彌勒受菩薩戒、後以戒法授覽。

・彼國法、凡聖燒身各處

『法顯傳』師子國（大正五一、八六五中）

城南七里有一精舍、名摩訶毘可羅、有三千僧住。有一高德沙門戒行清潔、國人咸疑是羅漢。臨終之時、王來省視、依法集僧而問、比丘得道耶。其便以實答言、是羅漢。既終、王即按經律、以羅漢法葬之。於精舍東四五里積好大薪、縱廣可三丈餘、高亦爾。近上著栴檀沈水諸香木、四邊作階上、持淨好白〔疊＋毛〕周匝蒙積上。作大輿床、似此間輜車、但無龍魚耳。當闍維時、王及國人四衆咸集、以華香供養。從輿至墓所、王自華香供養。供養訖、舉著〔くさかんむり＋積〕上、以酥油遍灌、然後燒之。火然時、人人敬心、各脫上服、及羽儀傘蓋、遙擲火中、以助闍維。闍維已、收斂取骨、即以起塔。法顯至不及其生存、唯見葬。

・徵瑞

『藝文類聚』卷十符命部符命引後漢傳幹王命敘

覽廢興之運會、觀徵瑞之攸祚、審天應之萌兆、察人物之所附。

七、宋北涼河西王弟京聲（劉宋の北涼の河西王の弟の沮渠京聲）

【原文】

觀世音經。

右。宋孝武世、北涼河西王**※**沮渠蒙遜從弟安陽侯京聲、屬涼運告終、爲元魏所滅。京聲竄**竊※**、南奔建康。晦志**卑※**身、不交人事、常遊止塔寺、以居士自**卑※**。絕妻**孥※**、淡榮利、縱容法侶、宣布正教。是以白黑咸加敬焉。譯出前經。

【校勘】

この條は【注釋】に挙げた『歷代三寶紀』卷十譯經宋世録に基づくであろう。

「王」 大正藏は下に「涅」あり、大正藏校勘記甲本はなし。底本は右側「ヒ」で削除を示している。

「竊」 大正藏は「[穴+偶]」に誤る。底本は「[穴+ネ+禺]」であり、「竊」としてよい。

「卑」 底本「畢」に作る。『出三藏記集』『高僧傳』『歴代三寶紀』に従い改める。

「卑」 大正藏は「畢」に誤る。底本は前の行の「畢」にかなり近いが、中央部の點は左側のみであり字形として「卑」と見なすのが妥当である。

「拏」 大正藏は「拏」に誤る。底本は「拏」左側に圈點、右側に訂正として「拏」を書いている。

【現代日本語譯】

『觀世音經』。

右。劉宋の孝武帝の世（劉駿、四五三～四六四在位）に、北涼の河西王沮渠蒙遜の從弟である安陽侯の沮渠京聲は、ちょうど北涼の命運が終わりを告げるのに巡り逢い、元魏（北魏）に滅ぼされてしまった。沮渠京聲は密かに身をくらませて、南に建康へと逃れた。心の内を明かさず控え目な態度をとり、人付き合いをせず、いつも佛寺に遊び、在家の居士として謙虚に振る舞った。妻子との関係を断ち切り、名譽と利益に無頓着で、佛法の仲間と和やかに交わり、佛の正しい教えを廣めた。そのため在家も出家もみな尊敬した。前掲の經典を譯出した。

【注釋】

・觀世音經 及び 安陽侯京聲

『出三藏記集』卷二新集撰出經律論録（大正五五、一三上）

觀彌勒菩薩生兜率天經一卷（或云、觀彌勒菩薩經、或云、觀彌勒經）。觀世音觀經一卷。禪要祕密治病經二卷（宋孝建二年於竹園寺譯出）。佛母般泥洹經一卷（孝建二年於鍾山定林上寺譯出、一名大愛道般泥洹經）。右四部、凡五卷。宋孝武帝時、僞河西王從弟沮渠安陽侯京都譯出。前二觀、先在高昌郡、久已譯出於彼、齎來京都。

『出三藏記集』卷十四沮渠安陽侯傳（大正五五、一〇六中～下）

沮渠安陽侯者、其先天水臨成縣胡人、河西王蒙遜之從弟也。……少時常度流涉到于闐國、於衢摩帝大寺遇天竺法師佛陀斯那、諮問道義。……安陽從受禪要祕密治病經、因其胡本、口誦通利。既而東歸、於高昌郡求得觀世音、彌勒二觀經各一卷。及還河西、即譯出禪要、轉爲漢文。居數年、魏虜託跋燾伐涼州、安陽宗國殄滅、遂南奔于宋。晦志卑身、不交世務、常遊止塔寺、以居士自畢。初、出彌勒、觀世音二觀經、丹陽尹孟顛見而善之、請與相見、一面之後、雅相崇愛、亟設供饌、厚相優

瞻。……安陽居絕妻孥、無欲榮利、從容法侶、宣通經典。是以京邑白黑咸敬而嘉焉。以大明之末遘疾卒。

『高僧傳』卷二譯經篇曇無讖傳附伝沮渠安陽侯は『出三藏記集』にはほぼ同じ。

『歴代三寶紀』卷十譯經宋世録（大正四九、九三上）

觀世音觀經一卷（見僧祐録）。……右三十五部合三十六卷。孝武帝世、北涼河西王沮渠蒙遜從弟安陽侯京聲、屬涼運終、爲元魏滅。京聲竄竊、南奔建康。晦志卑身、不交人世、常遊止塔寺、以居士自卑。絕妻孥、淡榮利、從容法侶、宣通正教。是以黑白咸嘉敬焉。所譯前件雜要衆經、既諷習久、對衆弘宣、臨筆綴文、曾無滯礙。丹陽尹孟顛見而善之、深加賞接、資贍隆厚。見高僧傳。

『歴代三寶紀』は『出三藏記集』及びそれを襲う『高僧傳』を踏まえて節略したものであり、『弘贊』は『歴代三寶紀』に基づくようである。

・北涼河西王沮渠蒙遜 及び 屬涼運告終、爲元魏所滅

『晉書』卷百二十九載紀沮渠蒙遜

沮渠蒙遜、臨松盧水胡人也。其先世爲匈奴左沮渠、遂以官爲氏焉。……屯據金山、與從兄男成推光建康太守段業爲使持節、大都督、龍驤大將軍、涼州牧、建康公、改呂光龍飛二年爲神璽元年。業以蒙遜爲張掖太守、男成爲輔國將軍、委以軍國之任。……業僭稱涼王、以蒙遜爲尚書左丞、梁中庸爲右丞。……隆安五年、梁中庸、房曷、田昂等推蒙遜爲使持節、大都督、大將軍、涼州牧、張掖公、赦其境內、改元永安。……俄而蒙遜遷于姑臧、以義熙八年僭即河西王位、大赦境內、改元玄始。……蒙遜以安帝隆安五年自稱州牧、義熙八年僭立、後八年而宋氏受禪、以元嘉十年死、時年六十六、在僞位三十三年。子茂虔立、六年、爲魏所擒、合三十九載而滅。

『魏書』卷四上太武帝紀太延五年

秋七月己巳、車駕至上郡屬國城、大饗羣臣、講武馬射。壬午、留輜重、分部諸軍。撫軍大將軍永昌王健、尚書令鉅鹿公劉潔督諸軍、與常山王素二道並進、爲前鋒。驃騎大將軍樂平王丕、太宰陽平王杜超、督平涼鄜城諸軍爲後繼。八月甲午、永昌王健獲牧犍牛馬畜產二十餘萬。牧犍遣弟董來率萬餘人拒戰於城南、望塵退走。丙申、車駕至姑臧、牧犍兒子祖暕城來降、乃分軍圍之。九月丙戌、牧犍兒子萬年率麾下來降。是日、牧犍與左右文武五千人面縛軍門、帝解其縛、待以藩臣之禮。收其城內戶口二十餘萬、倉庫珍寶不可稱計。

・自卑

『禮記』曲禮上

夫禮者、自卑而尊人。

・絶妻孥

『毛詩』小雅鹿鳴之什常棣

宜爾家室、樂爾妻帑。

毛傳云、帑、子也。

『南齊書』卷五十四高逸傳顧歡引夷夏論

今以中夏之性、効西戎之法、既不全同、又不全異。下棄妻孥、上廢宗祀。嗜欲之物、皆以禮伸、孝敬之典、獨以法屈。悖禮犯順、曾莫之覺。弱喪忘歸、孰識其舊。

・縱容

『莊子』外篇秋水

莊子與惠子遊於濠梁之上。莊子曰、儻魚出遊從容、是魚之樂也。

『漢書』卷四十三酈陸朱劉叔孫傳

陸賈位止大夫、致仕諸呂、不受憂責、從容平勃之間、附會將相以彊社稷、身名俱榮、其最優乎。

・法侶

『廣弘明集』卷十九蕭子良與荊州隱士劉虬書（大正五二、二三三中）

沾濠射之冥遊、屈祇鷲之法侶。闡三乘於窮子、發二諦於困蒙。

『廣弘明集』卷二十八蕭衍金剛波若懺文（大正五二、三三二下）

一念之善、千里斯應、一心之力、萬國皆歡。恒沙衆生、皆爲法侶、微塵世界、悉是道場。

八、齊**定林上**※寺釋法獻（南齊の定林上寺の釋法獻）

【原文】

妙法蓮花經提婆達多品。

右。沙門法獻、姓徐、西海延水人。先隨舅至梁州、仍出家。至元嘉十六年、方下京師、止定林上寺。傳通經律、志業強捍、善能**匡拯**※衆計、修葺寺宇。先聞猛公西遊、備囑靈異、乃誓欲忘身往觀聖迹。以宋元**徽**※三年、發踵金陵、西遊巴蜀、路出河南、道經**芮芮**※。既到于闐、欲度葱嶺、棧道斷絕、遂於于闐而返、獲此前品、於是而還。其經途危阻、具諸別記。獻以齊武帝永明年中、遇外國三藏法師達摩摩提、齊云法意、於揚州瓦官寺譯出。獻時爲僧主。以建武末年卒、春秋七十有五。

【校勘】

この條は【注釋】に挙げた『高僧傳』卷十三興福篇齊上定林寺釋法獻傳、『出三藏記集』卷二新集撰出經律論錄に加え、『歷代三寶紀』卷十一齊梁及周帝代錄、または『大唐內典錄』卷四前齊朝傳譯佛經錄に基づくであろう。

「定林上」 底本「上林」に作る。本條の本文、及び『高僧傳』に従い改める。

「匡拯」 底本は「匡」を「住」に作る。また「拯」は、大正藏は「極」としており、底本の字は「極」の右上部に二點を加えたような形である。いずれも字形の近さによる誤りとして、『高僧傳』に従い改める。

「徼」 底本「徼」に作る。大正藏校勘記甲本「徼カ」及び『高僧傳』に従い改める。

「芮芮」 底本「芮芮」に作る。『高僧傳』に従い改める。

【現代日本語譯】

『妙法蓮花經』提婆達多品。

右。沙門の法獻は、俗姓は徐、西海の延水の人である。初め母方の叔父について梁州に行き、それから出家した。元嘉十六年（四三九）になって、始めて都へと下り、定林上寺に住した。經典と律に廣く通曉しており、志は強く勇ましく、種々の計画を支援して、寺院を營繕するのを得意としていた。以前から猛公（智猛）が西へと旅して、佛の靈異を隈無く見たのを耳にしていたので、我が身の危険を省みずに聖なる遺跡を見に行こうと誓った。宋の元徽三年（四七五）、金陵（建康）を出發し、西に巴蜀（現在の四川省）へと赴き、河南（現在の甘肅省南部）を經由して、芮芮（柔然）の地を通過した。于闐に到着してから、葱嶺（パミール高原）を越えようとする、棧道が途切れていた、そのまま于闐で引き返し、この前述の提婆達多品を手に入れたので、歸還することにした。その危険な道のりについては『別記』に詳しい。法獻は南齊の武帝の永明年間（四八三～四九三）に、外國の三藏法師である達摩摩提、齊では法意という僧に出會い、楊州（建康）の瓦官寺で譯出した。法獻はその頃に僧主になった。建武年間（四九四～四九八）の末年に卒し、七十五歳であった。

【注釋】

・妙法蓮花經提婆達多品 及び 外國三藏法師達摩摩提、齊云法意

『出三藏記集』卷二新集撰出經律論錄（大正五五、一三中～下）

觀世音懺悔除罪呪經一卷（永明八年十二月十五日譯出）。妙法蓮華經提婆達多品第十二、一卷。右二部凡二卷。齊武皇帝時、先師獻正遊西域、於于闐國得觀世音懺悔呪胡本、還京都、請瓦官禪房三藏法師法意共譯出。自流沙以西、妙法蓮華經並有提

婆達多品、而中夏所傳闕此一品。先師至高昌郡、於彼獲本、仍寫還京都。今別爲一卷。

『歷代三寶紀』卷十一齊梁及周帝代錄（大正四九、九五下）

右二經合二卷。武帝世、外國三藏法師達摩摩提、齊言法意、永明年爲沙門法獻時爲僧正獻於揚州瓦官寺譯出。獻初以宋元徽三年遊歷西域、於于闐國得此經梵本來并佛牙。經譯流行、相傳至今。

『歷代三寶紀』は「時爲僧正獻」の部分に亂れがあるようで、『大唐内典録』卷四前齊朝傳譯佛經録が「永明年爲沙門法獻於揚州瓦官寺譯出。獻時爲僧正」（大正五五、二六二下）とするのが正しいだろう。『弘贊』は現行本では『大唐内典録』に近い。

・沙門法獻

『高僧傳』卷十三興福篇齊上定林寺釋法獻傳（大正五〇、四一一中～四一二上）

釋法獻、姓徐、西海延水人。先隨舅至梁州、乃出家。至元嘉十六年、方下京師、止定林上寺。博通經律、志業強捍、善能匡拯衆許、修葺寺宇。先聞猛公西遊、備矚靈異、乃誓欲忘身往觀聖迹。以宋元徽三年、發踵金陵、西遊巴蜀、路出河南、道經芮芮。既到于闐、欲度葱嶺、值棧道斷絕、遂於于闐而反。獲佛牙一枚、舍利十五身、并觀世音滅罪呪、及調達品、又得龜茲國金鎚鑠像、於是而還。其經途危阻、見其別記。佛牙本在烏纏國、自烏纏來芮芮、自芮芮來梁土、獻齋牙還京五十有五載、密自禮事、餘無知者。至文宣感夢、方傳道俗。獻律行精純、德爲物範、瑯琊王肅、王融、吳國張融、張綰、沙門慧令、智藏等、並投身接足、崇其誠訓。獻以永明之中、被敕與長干玄暢同爲僧主、分任南北兩岸。……獻以建武末年卒、與暢同窆于鍾山之陽。獻弟子僧祐爲造碑墓側、丹陽尹吳興沈約製文。獻於西域所得佛牙及像皆在上定林寺。

・西海延水

『晉書』卷十四地理志上涼州

西海郡（故屬張掖、漢獻帝興平二年、武威太守張雅請置。統縣一、戶二千五百）。居延（澤在東南、尚書所謂流沙也）。

岩波文庫『高僧傳』（四）の注は、西海郡の屬縣に延水縣はなく、居延の誤りである可能性を指摘する。

・梁州

『宋書』卷三十七州郡志梁州

梁州刺史、禹貢舊州、周以梁併雍、漢以梁爲益、治廣漢雒縣。魏元帝景元四年平蜀、復立梁州、治漢中南鄭、而益州治成都。李氏據梁益、江左於襄陽僑立梁州。李氏滅、復舊。譙縱時、又沒漢中。刺史治魏興。縱滅、刺史還治漢中之苞中縣、所謂南城也。文帝元嘉十年、刺史甄法護於南城失守、刺史蕭思話還治南鄭。

・匡拯

『晉書』卷三武帝紀泰始元年

粵在魏室、仍世多故、幾於顛墜、實賴有晉匡拯之德、用獲保厥肆祀、弘濟于艱難、此則晉之有大造于魏也。

・修葺

『宋書』卷六孝武帝紀大明五年

今息警夷嶂、恬波河渚、棧山航海、嚮風慕義、化民成俗、茲焉時矣。來歲可修葺庠序、旌延國胄。

・猛公西遊、備囑靈異

智猛は後秦の弘始六年（四〇四）に長安を出發し、約十年かけて涼州から鄯鄯・龜茲・奇沙國・于闐を経て、罽賓・迦羅衛國・華氏城を巡り、各地で佛の遺物や靈跡を見て回り、劉宋の元嘉十四年（四三七）に蜀へと至り、十六年（四三九）には都の建康に戻っていた。

『出三藏記集』卷十五智猛法師傳（大正五五、一一三中～下）

釋智猛、雍州京兆郡新豐縣人也。……每見外國道人說釋迦遺跡、又聞方等衆經布在
西域、常慨然有感、馳心遐外、以爲萬里咫尺、千載可追也。遂以僞秦弘始六年戊辰
之歲、招結同志沙門十有五人、發跡長安、度河順谷三十六渡、至涼州城。既而西出
陽關、入流沙。……遂歷鄯鄯、龜茲、于闐諸國、備觀風俗。從于闐西南行二千里、
始登葱嶺、而同侶九人退還。猛遂進行千七百餘里、至波淪國。……復南行千里、至
罽賓國、再度辛頭河。……既至罽賓城、恒有五百羅漢住此國中、而常往反阿耨達
池。……猛先於奇沙國見佛文石唾壺、又於此國見佛鉢。……復西南行千三百里、至
迦羅衛國、見佛髮、佛牙、及肉髻骨、佛影、佛跡炳然具存。又覩泥洹堅固之林、降
魔菩提之樹。……其所遊踐、究觀靈變、天梯龍池之事不可勝數。後至華氏城、是阿
育王舊都、有大智婆羅門、名羅閱宗。……猛就其家得泥洹胡本一部、又尋得摩訶僧
祇律一部及餘經胡本、誓願流通、於是便反。以甲子歲發天竺、同行四僧於路無常、
唯猛與曇曇俱還於涼州、譯出泥洹本、得二十卷。以元嘉十四年入蜀。十六年七月七
日、於鍾山定林寺造傳。猛以元嘉末卒。

・河南

河南は鮮卑の乞伏氏や、慕容氏に連なる吐谷渾が支配した黄河上流域の南側の地を指し、現在の甘肅省南部に当たる。

『魏書』卷九十九鮮卑乞伏國仁傳

鮮卑乞伏國仁、出於隴西。其先如弗自漠北南出。五代祖祐隣并兼諸部、部衆漸盛。父司繁、擁部落降於苻堅、以爲南單于、又拜鎮西將軍、鎮勇士川。司繁死、國仁代統任。苻堅之伐司馬昌明、以國仁爲前將軍、領騎先鋒。及堅之敗、國仁叔步顔叛於隴右、堅令國仁討之、步顔大悅、迎而推之、招集部落、衆十餘萬。太祖時、私署大都督、大將軍、大單于、秦州河州牧、號年建義、署置官屬、分部內爲十一郡、築勇士城以都之。國仁死、弟乾歸統事、自署大都督、大將軍、大單于、河南王、改年爲太初、署百官。……乾歸乃背姚興、私稱秦王、置百官、年號更始。遣使請援、太宗許之。後乾歸田於五谿、梟集其手、尋爲兄子公府所殺。子熾磐殺公府、代統位。熾磐、自稱大將軍、河南王、改年爲永康。……熾磐死、子暮末統任。暮末、字安石跋。既立、改年爲永洪。……赫連定遣其北平公韋伐率衆一萬攻南安、城內大饑、人相食。神麴四年、暮末及宗族五百餘人出降、送於上邽。

『梁書』卷五十四諸夷傳西北諸戎河南王國

河南王者、其先出自鮮卑慕容氏。初、慕容奕洛干有二子、庶長曰吐谷渾、嫡曰廐。洛干卒、廐嗣位、吐谷渾避之西徙。廐追留之、而牛馬皆西走、不肯還、因遂西上隴、度枹罕、出涼州西南、至赤水而居之。其地則張掖之南、隴西之西、在河之南、故以爲號。其界東至疊川、西隣于闐、北接高昌、東北通秦嶺、方千餘里、蓋古之流沙地焉。……其後吐谷渾孫葉延、頗識書記、自謂曾祖奕洛干始封昌黎公、吾蓋公孫之子也。禮以王父字爲國氏、因姓吐谷渾、亦爲國號。至其末孫阿豺、始受中國官爵。弟子慕延、宋元嘉末又自號河南王。慕延死、從弟拾寅立、乃用書契、起城池、築宮殿、其小王並立宅。國中有佛法。拾寅死、子度易侯立。易侯死、子休留代立。

・芮芮

モンゴル高原を主たる勢力範囲とした北方遊牧民族の柔然で、他に芮芮・蠕蠕・茹茹・蠕蠕などの表記がある。

『宋書』卷九十五索虜傳芮芮虜

自索虜破慕容、據有中國、而芮芮虜有其故地、蓋漢世匈奴之北庭也。芮芮一號大檀、又號檀檀、亦匈奴別種。自西路通京師、三萬餘里。僭稱大號、部衆殷強、歲時遣使詣京師、與中國亢禮、西域諸國焉耆・鄯善・龜茲・姑墨東道諸國、並役屬之。

『魏書』卷百三蠕蠕傳

蠕蠕、東胡之苗裔也、姓郁久閭氏。始神元之末、掠騎有得一奴、髮始齊眉、忘本姓名、其主字之曰木骨閭。……木骨閭死、子車鹿會雄健、始有部衆、自號柔然、而役屬於國。後世祖以其無知、狀類於蟲、故改其號爲蠕蠕。……其西北有匈奴餘種……後盡爲社崙所并。號爲強盛。隨水草畜牧、其西則焉耆之地、東則朝鮮之地、北則渡沙漠、窮瀚海、南則臨大磧。其常所會庭則敦煌・張掖之北。小國皆苦其寇抄、羈縻附之、於是自號丘豆伐可汗。……和平五年、吐賀真死、子予成立、號受羅部真可汗、魏言惠也。自稱永康元年、率部侵塞、北鎮遊軍大破其衆。

・危阻

『藝文類聚』卷三十五人部愁引魏陳王曹植九愁賦

踐蹊徑之危阻、登岩嶢之高岑。見失群之離獸、覲偏栖之孤禽。

・揚州瓦官寺

『高僧傳』卷五義解篇晉京師瓦官寺竺法汰傳（大正五〇、三五四下～三五五上）

瓦官寺本是河內山玩公墓爲陶處。晉興寧中、沙門慧力啓乞爲寺、止有堂塔而已。及汰居之、更拓房宇、修立衆業、又起重門、以可地勢。

『高僧傳』卷十三興福篇晉京師瓦官寺釋慧力傳（大正五〇、四一〇上）

釋慧力、未知何人。晉永和中、來遊京師。常乞蔬食苦行、頭陀修福。至晉興寧中、啓乞陶處、以爲瓦官寺。

『建康實錄』卷八東晉哀帝興寧二年

是歲、詔移陶官于淮水北、遂以南岸窯處之地施僧慧力、造瓦官寺。

Author Guidelines

Submission Eligibility

Faculty members (professors, associate professors and lecturers) of the Faculty of International Studies and those who are authorised by the Editorial Committee of the journal.

Originality

A contribution will not be considered for publication if it is concurrently under consideration by another journal or publisher or if it has been accepted for publication elsewhere. Any previous publication of the submitted manuscript in any other languages must be fully disclosed.

Language

Contributions are accepted in Chinese, English, French, Japanese and Korean.

Abstract

All manuscripts submitted to the journal must include an abstract in English.

Format

Manuscripts should be submitted in Microsoft Word.

Word length

The length of manuscripts should not exceed 20,000 characters in Chinese, 12,000 words in English and French, and 30,000 characters in Japanese and Korean, including body, notes, references and appendices; unless permitted by the Editorial Committee. The length of the abstract is 100-150 words.

Review

Journal of International Studies is not a peer-reviewed journal, although all submissions will be reviewed by the Editorial Committee and only those manuscripts that meet academic standards will be published.

Disclaimer

All statements of facts and opinions in articles in *Journal of International Studies* are those of the respective authors and contributors.

Copyright

Authors retain the copyright of their papers. Upon acceptance, authors grant Kindai University and the Faculty of International Studies the licence to publish and reproduce the article in the journal and to communicate it to the public in print or digital form.

The Editorial Committee of *Journal of International Studies*
Faculty of International Studies, Kindai University
3-4-1 Kowakae, Higashiosaka City, Osaka 577-8502, Japan
E-mail: journal@intl.kindai.ac.jp

Contents

A Study on the Similarity of Korean and Japanese Translations of
Titles for Classical Piano Pieces

Yoonok Lee

Revisiting Developmental State Theory in East Asia and Latin America

Carlos Ramirez

Leo Strauss's Theory on Tyranny: Ancient and Modern

Reimon Sakai

An Annotated Translation of Huixiang's *Hongzhanfahuazhuan juan 2* Fanyi (the first half)

Mio Murata

This journal is available online at:

<http://int-studies.kindai.ac.jp/curriculum/journal/>

ISSN 2432-292X (Print)

ISSN 2432-2938 (Online)

