

## 〈研究論文〉

## 室町期在京領主吉良氏と遠江国浜松庄

谷口雄太

本稿では十四世紀後半～十五世紀前半の吉良氏の浜松支配につき、特に寺社統制の問題を中心に検討し、その上で、一国の領主と守護の関係、連動する都鄙の姿、都鄙を結ぶ道の実態についても指摘した。

第一章では十四世紀後半の吉良氏と浜松につき検討した。観応擾乱後、幕府に帰参した吉良氏は、斯波派と組んで中央で復権し、浜松も獲得した。だが、同氏は同時期、斯波派とはライバル関係にあたる今川氏とも姻戚を構築した。その理由は地方の在り方、具体的には遠江・浜松をめぐる政治情勢にあった。浜松領主吉良氏―遠江守護今川氏の関係から両者は姻戚を結んだのである。

吉良氏の浜松支配を見ると、それは十四世紀に始まった。しかし、そこは真言宗が威勢を誇る場であった。かくして吉良氏は真言宗勢力の相対化を図り、その寺領を没収して禅僧に寄進し、禅宗を浜松に引き入れようとした。だが、それは失敗した。理由の一つは真言宗の強い反対、もう一つは守護今川氏の非協力である。吉良氏は中央では斯波氏と、地方ではそのライバル今川氏と組むという外交を展開した。しかし、それは今川氏が守護を務める遠州に、斯波氏と近い禅宗を導入するという点ではマイナスに働いた。二重外交の限界である。

第二章では十五世紀前半の吉良氏と浜松につき検討した。十五世紀、浜松の信仰空間は一変した。禅宗が台頭したのである。こうした変化の背景としては新遠江守護斯波氏との緊密な関係と守護による遠江支配の安定の下、吉良氏も浜松内外で領主支配を深化させることに成功したこと、そして、今川氏が遠江守護を務めた前世紀とは異なって、都鄙ともに斯波氏と連携するという時代に移り、吉良氏にとって二重外交状態が解消したことで、禅宗の遠州浜松への導入に障壁がなくなったことが大きかったとした。

以上をふまえ、一国の領主にとって守護と協調することの重要性、地方の在り方が中央政治に与える影響、必ずしもスムーズに展開しない都鄙間の禅宗の道を指摘し、近年の室町期権力論を批判・補完した。

【吉良氏、遠江国、浜松庄、斯波氏、今川氏、真言宗、禅宗、守護、地域、都鄙】

## *Ryōshu* in Absentia: The Kira Family and the Hamamatsu Estate in the Muromachi Period

TANIGUCHI Yūta

This paper examines the Kira family's rule of Hamamatsu in the province of Tōtōmi (present-day Shizuoka prefecture) from the second half of the fourteenth century to the first half of the fifteenth century, mainly regarding control over temples and shrines. It discusses the relationship between

the *ryōshu* (proprietary lords) and *shugo* (governors) in Tōtōmi, linkages between the capital and the provinces, and conditions relating to the roads connecting them.

The first part of the study considers the Kira family and its Hamamatsu estate in the latter half of the fourteenth century. Returning to the service of the bakufu after the civil unrest during the Kannō era (1350–1352), the Kira, allied with the Shiba family, were reinstated in Kyoto and also acquired the Hamamatsu domain. During the same period, however, they established relations by marriage to the Imagawa family, rivals of the Shiba-led faction. The reason for the new liaison was Hamamatsu politics. The Kira, although basing themselves in Kyoto, were the *ryōshu* of Hamamatsu whereas the Imagawa were the *shugo* of Tōtōmi province. The two families established matrimonial ties to strengthen their respective bases.

The Kira family rule of Hamamatsu started in the fourteenth century, at a time when Shingon Buddhism was dominant there. In their attempt to relativize the power of the Shingon school, the Kira tried to seize territories controlled by Shingon temples and donate them to the Zen school so as to bring Zen influence into Hamamatsu. The attempt ended in failure, partly because of the strong Shingon resistance and partly because the Imagawa were uncooperative. The Kira family initially pursued a dual diplomatic strategy of alliance with the Shiba in the capital and alliance with the Shiba rival Imagawa in Tōtōmi, but the strategy worked negatively for the Kira when it tried to introduce Zen, with which the Shiba were closely associated, in a province governed by the Imagawa. There were limits to the dual diplomacy.

The second part of the study deals with the Kira and Hamamatsu in the first half of the fifteenth century. During the fifteenth century the Zen school extended its influence and the religious milieu in the province changed. One of the main factors here was that the Kira successfully established their rule as *ryōshu* within and beyond Hamamatsu as their relations with the Shiba, the new *shugo* of Tōtōmi province, grew closer and rule of the province stabilized. Moreover, unlike in the previous century when the Imagawa had served as *shugo*, the Kira were now allied with the Shiba both in the capital and in the province. The dual diplomacy was no longer necessary, and the obstacles to the introduction of Zen to Hamamatsu were no more.

Based on the above discussion, the paper points to the importance for the *ryōshu* of alliance with *shugo* and to the influence of provincial affairs on politics in the capital. It also illustrates how the spread of Zen from the capital to the provinces did not always go smoothly. These findings seek to critique and complement the recent discourse concerning power structures in the Muromachi period.

**Keywords** : Kira family, Tōtōmi, Hamamatsu, Shiba, Imagawa, Shingon, Zen, *shugo*, provincial affairs, *tohi* (capital and provinces)

---

## 〈研究論文〉

# 白醉庵吉村観阿について

宮 武 慶 之

吉村（芳村）観阿（一七六五—一八四八）は江戸時代後期に活躍した町人数寄者である。観阿の行状としては、同人が所持していた俊乗房重源（一一二一—一二〇六）による勧進状

——東大寺東塔の完成後は童を配して法華經を千部、転読させたい旨を認めている——を東大寺に寄進し、その敷地内に寿藏（生前墓碑）<sup>じゅぞう</sup>の建立を許されたこと、松江藩七代藩主松平治郷（不昧／一七五一—一八一八）や新発田藩十代藩主溝口直諒（翠濤／一七九九—一八五八）の茶会に参会したこと、八十歳の年賀に際し蒔絵師の原羊遊斎（一七六九—一八四五）に依頼し一閑張桃之絵細棗を百二十五個作成させたことがよく知られている。

観阿に関する先行研究では、その墓碑および観阿作の茶碗や茶杓などが取り上げられてきた。また観阿の言動を後世になって書き留めた『白醉庵筆記』が紹介されている。しかし先行研究では、観阿が江戸時代後期の主要な茶人であるにもかかわらず、資料の不足からその行状を十分明らかにできていない。本稿では観阿の所蔵や取次ぎ、制作が確認される茶器・茶道具および、溝口家資料に注目する。これらの新たに判明した資料を活用し、観阿の行状を明らかにすることで、松平家および溝口家の道具蒐集など、観阿を取り巻く当時の茶の湯文化を検討する。

本稿では、次の四点に注目する。一点目は観阿と不昧、翠濤との交流である。両者との交流を茶会や道具の取次ぎから検討する。二点目は法隆寺が所蔵する弘法大師額の額箱である。額箱には観阿、妻観勢、その子の署名が確認でき、観阿の妻子について検討する。三点目は観阿の八十賀の茶会である。今回の調査ではその八十賀茶会記を確認し、茶会で使用された道具についても検討する。四点目は観阿の生業として道具の取次である。その具体的な状況を明らかにするため、溝口家史料および、同家旧藏品のうち現存する作品と売立目録を活用し、観阿に関係する作品を明らかにする。

以上の点から主要な茶人であるにもかかわらず、十分な研究の及んでいなかった観阿について、新資料を用いながら、その行状や関連作品を明らかにする。

【白醉庵、目利、取次、松平不昧、溝口翠濤、一閑張桃之絵細棗、勸進状、東大寺、法隆寺、弘福寺】

## On Yoshimura Kan'a (1765–1848), Late-Edo Tea Connoisseur

MIYATAKE Yoshiyuki

Yoshimura Kan'a was a leading tea connoisseur of the merchant class (pseudonym “Hakusuian”) active in the late Edo period. Kan'a is a familiar character. First, he donated to Tōdaiji the *kanjinjō* letter by the Priest Chōgen (1121–1206), containing the message that after the east pagoda at the Tōdaiji was completed he would have a group of boys recite the Lotus Sutra a thousand times before the pagoda), and was granted permission by the temple during his lifetime to erect his tombstone on the temple grounds. Second, he attended tea parties hosted by Matsudaira Harusato (pseudonym Fumai, 1751–1818), 7th lord of Matsue domain, and Mizoguchi Naoaki (Suitō, 1799–1858), 10th lord of Shibata domain. At the age of eighty, Kan'a had *maki-e* artist Hara Yōyūsai (1769–1845) produce 125 tea caddies with a peach design to present to people as his New Year's gift.

Previous studies on Kan'a have dealt with the tombstone as well as the tea implements he personally made such as tea bowls and scoops. The *Hakusuian hikki* (Notes on Hakusuian), an

account of his words and deeds written in a later period, has also been introduced. Such studies, however, have suffered from a lack of information. This paper focuses on Kan'a's collection, the tea utensils confirmed to have been made with his involvement as creator or middleman (*toritsugi*), and materials passed down in the Mizoguchi family. Informed by these newly discovered resources, including the tea utensil collections of the Matsudaira and Mizoguchi daimyo families, and the details they offer about Kan'a, the paper discusses the late-Edo-period *chanoyu* culture of which Kan'a was a part.

The paper takes up four topics. The first is Kan'a's association with Matsudaira Fumai and Mizoguchi Suitō. Their acquaintance is examined in terms of tea parties and Kan'a's services as middleman in the acquisition of tea utensils. The second concerns the inscriptions on the box containing the framed calligraphy by Kōbō Daishi in the collection of the Hōryūji. The box carries signatures by Kan'a, his wife Kansei, and their child. His wife and child are also the object of study here. The third is the tea gathering held to celebrate Kan'a's 80th birthday. My recent research examines the record (*chaki*) of this tea party, and discusses the tea implements used at the party as described there. The fourth is Kan'a's occupation as middleman. To clarify what he actually did, the paper draws on historical documents of the Mizoguchi family and extant works and sales catalogues in the former collection of the family for information about works related to Kan'a.

Citing mainly newly discovered documents and artifacts relating to Kan'a, this study sheds light on a cultural figure who has been inadequately researched until now.

**Keywords** : connoisseur, *toritsugi*, Matsudaira Fumai, Mizoguchi Suitō, “tea caddy with peach design,” *kanjinjō*, *Tōdaiji*, *Hōryūji*, *Kōfukuji*

---

## 〈研究論文〉

# 改元を通して見た天皇

——「昭和」改元と「平成」改元の比較分析

鈴木洋仁

本稿は、「平成」改元にあたって、小渕恵三官房長官（当時）が行った記者会見を分析することによって、大日本帝国憲法（1889）と日本国憲法（1947）における天皇の位置づけの相違を分析するものである。具体的には、改元を天皇による「時間支配」の究極の形式と定義したうえで、「平成」改元における、（1）政治性、（2）公開性、（3）メディア性という3点の違いを抽出する。なぜなら、日本国憲法においても、大日本帝国憲法と同様、「一世一元」の原則が法律で定められているからである。

改元の政治性とは、改元における権力を、誰が持っているのか、という点であり、天皇から内閣へと移っている。すなわち、天皇は、改元の場合において、政治性を帯びていない。そして、改元の公開性とは、「平成」改元すなわち、日本国憲法下での改元においては、記者会見を開いたという点である。対して1926年の「昭和」改元においては、記者会見が開かれなかったために、新元号を「光文」とする誤報事件が起きていた。最後の改元のメディア性とは、発表する側が、メディアを意識していたか否か、という点である。「昭和」にお

いては、意識するほどにメディアは発達していなかったが、「平成」においては「テレビ時代だから」として、新元号を発表する当時の内閣官房長官が「平成」の書を掲げるほどの発展を遂げていた。

以上のことから、本稿は、「時間支配」という点において、「昭和」改元は、その完成形態であり、「平成」改元は、「視覚的支配」をも組み入れた新たな「時間支配」とであると結論づけている。

【天皇と政治、改元、元号、憲法、権力、時間支配、天皇とメディア、テレビ時代】

## The Emperor and the Change of Era Names: A Comparison of “Shōwa” and “Heisei”

SUZUKI Hirohito

This paper analyzes the press conference held by Obuchi Keizō, then chief cabinet secretary, to announce the new era name “Heisei,” in order to examine the difference in the position of the emperor between the 1889 Constitution of the Empire of Japan (the “Meiji Constitution”) and the current Constitution of Japan (1947). Defining the change of eras as the ultimate form of temporal domination exercised by the emperors, I extract from the era change to “Heisei” three main differences compared to the Meiji Constitution, although the post-World War II constitution continues the principle of “one reign-one era name” (*issei ichigen*) as laid down in the Meiji Constitution. (The 1989 era change was the first to take place under the postwar Constitution.) The differences are in terms of political implications, “openness,” and the use of the mass media.

Regarding political implications, the paper shows how the locus of authority to change the era name has shifted in contemporary practice from the emperor to the cabinet. In the adoption of the Heisei era name, the emperor played no political role. “Openness,” refers here to the holding of the press conference, an event demonstrating that the change of eras was open to the public under the postwar Constitution. At the time of the era change to “Shōwa” in 1926 no press conference was held, with the result that a false report was circulated that the new era name was “Kōbun.” Regarding the use of the media, the question is whether the announcer of the new era name was conscious of the mass media. In the case of the change to “Shōwa,” the mass media had not developed sufficiently for the announcer to be conscious of its use, whereas, by the time of the adoption of “Heisei” the media had developed to the point where the chief cabinet secretary, took advantage of the “age of television,” and held up a board for viewers displaying the characters “Heisei.”

The paper concludes that the era change to “Shōwa” was the ultimate form of the emperor’s temporal domination while the change to “Heisei” was a new form of temporal domination that incorporated “visual domination.”

**Keywords :** emperor and politics, change of eras, era name, the Constitution, power, temporal domination, emperor and the media, age of television

## 研究ノート

## 美術史は全球化しうるか？

——極東の視点からする批判的注釈

稲賀 繁美

学術としての「美術史学」は全球化（globalize）できるか。この話題に関して、2005年にアイルランドのコークで国際会議が開かれ、報告書が2007年に刊行された。筆者は日本から唯一この企画への参加を求められ、コメントを提出した。本稿はこれを日本語に翻訳し、必要な増補を加えたものである。すでに原典刊行から8年を経過し、「全球化」は日本にも浸透をみせている話題である。だがなぜか日本での議論は希薄であり、また従来と同じく、一時の流行として処理され、日本美術史などの専門領域からは、問題意識が共有されるには至っていない。そうした状況に鑑み、本稿を研究ノートとして日本語でも読めるかたちで提供する。

本稿は、全球化について、①アカデミックな学問分野としての制度上の問題、②日本美術史、あるいは東洋美術史という対象の枠組の問題、③学術上の手続きの問題、④基本的な鍵術語（key term）の概念規定と、その翻訳可能性、という4点に重点を絞り、日本や東洋の学術に必ずしも通じていない西洋の美術史研究者を対象として、基本的な情報提供をおこなう。【全球化、美術史、オリエンタリズム、未開主義、ジャポニスム、工芸、島田修二郎、矢代幸雄、ヴェルフリン】

## Is Art History Globalizable? A Critical Commentary from a Far Eastern Point of View

INAGA Shigemi

“Is Art History Global?” This was the topic taken up at an international seminar held in Cork, Ireland in 2005, the proceedings of which were published in 2007 under the title *Is Art History Global?* (New York: Routledge 2007). The author of this paper, who was the only Japanese invited, submitted comments to the seminar. This paper provides a version of these comments, translated into Japanese and elaborated somewhat from the draft. Today, eight years since the proceedings of the symposium was published, the discourse on the “globalization” of art history has begun to spread in Japan, but the discussion remains curiously superficial and is generally dismissed as a passing fashion. As a result, there is little shared awareness about this issue among specialists in Japanese art history and related disciplines.

Concerning the globalization of art history, this in Japan paper focuses on four areas:

- (1) institutional issues related to the academic field of art history;
- (2) problems with the framework of Japanese art history or East Asian art history;
- (3) issues of scholarly procedures in the field; and
- (4) basic definitions of key terms and the potential for their translation into other languages. The paper provides basic information for Western art history scholars who might not be familiar with

art history scholarship in Japan and East Asia (the English version: [http://www.nichibun.ac.jp/~aurora/pdf/2IsArtHistoryGlobalizable\(revisedonJune20\)pdf\\_put.pdf](http://www.nichibun.ac.jp/~aurora/pdf/2IsArtHistoryGlobalizable(revisedonJune20)pdf_put.pdf)).

**Keywords** : globalization, art history, orientalism, primitivism, japonisme, arts and crafts, Shimada Shūjirō, Yashiro Yukio, Heinrich Wölfflin