



Professors Kasaya, Sueki and Hayakawa
at the 58th Public Lecture

第58回学術講演会にて、
左から笠谷、末木、早川教授

In spring 2015, professors Kasaya Kazuhiko, Sueki Fumihiko, and Hayakawa Monta retired from Nichibunken. At the public lecture held on March 25, the three presented their retirement lectures to a full audience in the Nichibunken auditorium. The following are summaries of the lectures provided by the three professors.

(Editorial Department)

In Search of a New Historical Image of the Edo Period

KASAYA Kazuhiko (Professor Emeritus)

The study of the Battle of Sekigahara (1600) is rather an introductory part of research on the politics and society of the Tokugawa period, in particular the *bakuhatsu taisei* (the shogunate-domains political system), that lasted for more than 260 years from 1603 to 1868. Conventionally, the battle is described by saying that “the victory of the eastern forces led by Tokugawa Ieyasu provided the cornerstone upon which the Tokugawa regime built the political system that continued thereafter.”

日文研では、今春、定年を迎えられた笠谷和比古、早川聞多、末木文美士の3教授が退職されました。3月25日に開催された学術講演会では、この3人の先生が、大講堂を埋め尽くす聴衆の前に退職記念講演をなさいました。お三方よりいただいた講演の要旨を、以下に掲載いたします。

(編集部)

江戸時代の新しい 歴史像を求めて 笠谷和比古 (名誉教授)

関ヶ原合戦研究は、それ以後260年余にわたる徳川時代の政治と社会、特に幕藩体制とよばれる政治体制を研究するための序論的研究としての意義を有する。従来の関ヶ原合戦に関する定説は、「家康率いる東軍の勝利をもって、以後260年余にわたって存続する徳川政権の盤石の基を築いたもの」というにあった。しかしながらこの認識に誤りがあるとしたら、それは関ヶ原合戦の歴史像の修正を要するのみならず、以後260年余にわたる徳川社会全体の歴史

Should there be anything in error with this perception, then, one would be forced to revise not only historical images of the Battle of Sekigahara but also of the social system of the Tokugawa period as a whole. Based on my research that greatly diverges from the conventional view, I will present in this lecture a new understanding of Tokugawa society as a whole. Looking at how the territories were distributed throughout the country following the Battle of Sekigahara, one could see that Tokugawa-related domains made up only about one third of the entire country, consisting mainly of the eight provinces of Kanto (Sagami, Musashi, Awa, Kazusa, Shimousa, Hitachi, Kōzuke and Shimotsuke) and those along the Tōkaidō highway between Edo and Kyoto. The remaining two thirds of the country was in fact controlled by *tozama daimyō* (outside lords) who were not directly subordinate to the Tokugawa by family lineage or hereditary service (about one third were controlled by former retainers of the Toyotomi family and the other third by *kyūzoku*, “old families” related to neither the Tokugawa nor the Toyotomi). In particular, the former Toyotomi-related generals who switched their allegiance and sided with Ieyasu at Sekigahara expanded their power, each of them being promoted to daimyō with one or more provinces under their rule and becoming firmly established in the region westward from Kyoto. One could note that practically no territory with direct links to the Tokugawa lay in those western parts.

Ieyasu and his Tokugawa family had to manage their control over the country not from the vantage point of a firm and monolithic power but in fact on the premise of this inferior position. It is this structural contradiction between the scope of its power and the reality of its strength that determined the policies and actions of the Tokugawa regime. One could better understand the meaning of Tokugawa regime policies from the context of how they attempted to overcome and get around that contradiction. The significance of Ieyasu’s appointment as *sei taishōgun* (literally, the Barbarian-subduing Generalissimo) is one example of that strategy. The Toyotomi regime was not dismantled as a result of the Battle of Sekigahara; in fact, the regime that Toyotomi Hideyoshi had constructed continued to exist, “following the laws put in place by Hideyoshi as *taikō*” (*Taikō-sama okime no gotoku*). Ieyasu did break away from that system and establish instead the Tokugawa regime based on a new political system headed by the Tokugawa shoguns, but what he aimed for was a dual system of government by the Toyotomi regime and his own, dividing the country into two with Kyoto at the boundary line. In order to overcome this vulnerable position and aim at an essentially Tokugawa-led control of government, the Tokugawa

像の修正を余儀なくするであろう。本講義は、関ヶ原合戦をめぐる旧来の定説とは大きく異なる筆者独自の研究成果を踏まえて、徳川社会全体に対する新たな歴史認識を示したものである。関ヶ原合戦後における全国的領地配置を眺めるならば、徳川系領国は関八州と東海道筋など日本全土の三分の一ほどに止まり、三分の二は非徳川の外様大名の領国（三分の一が旧族系、三分の一が豊臣系）であるというのが現実であった。殊に関ヶ原合戦において家康に同盟した豊臣系武将たちの躍進はめざましく、それぞれ国持大名へと成長し、京より西の西国方面に盤踞することとなった。そしてこの西国方面には徳川系領国が皆無であることも著しい点であった。

家康と徳川家とは、盤石の態勢ではなく、この劣弱な状況を前提にして全国統治を進めねばならなかった。この構造的な矛盾こそが、徳川政権の政策と動態とを規定しており、この矛盾を克服し、回避する目的の観点から徳川政権の諸施策の意義を理解し、位置づけることができる。家康の征夷大將軍任官の意義もその一つ。関ヶ原合戦によって豊臣政権は解体されるのではなく、「太閤様御置目の如く」と表現されたように豊臣秀吉の構築した豊臣公儀体制は存続していた。家康はこの体制から離脱をして徳川將軍家を頂点とする新たな政治体制—徳川公儀体制を設けるが、それは豊臣体制との間で、京都を境に東西分有する二重公儀体制を志向していた。そしてこの不安定さを克



turned to the idea of sending a daughter of the family to the palace as a consort of Emperor Gomizuno-o, hoping for an emperor of Tokugawa lineage. Following the Battle of Osaka (1614–1615), the Toyotomi family and its supporters were defeated, but this forced the Tokugawa *bakufu* to face the problem of the western provinces more directly and become more deeply involved with the significance of the emperor system.

The lecture will also present the way the introduction of these new analytical perspectives overturns conventional understandings of some of the well-known political institutions—the *Buke shohatto* system of laws, the expropriation or transfer of territories of daimyō, the policy of national seclusion, and *sankin kōtai* (alternate attendance at Edo castle)—that have been considered the bastions of Tokugawa power.

“Early Modern” in the History of Thought

SUEKI Fumihiko (Professor Emeritus)

I specialize in Buddhist thought of Japan’s medieval period. In the course of my study of this subject, I have discovered that study of medieval times has long been viewed through the lens of modernity. In other words, when something in medieval times is found rational in a modern sense, it is viewed positively, whereas not found rational, it is seen negatively. I could not but find this approach clearly biased. I then decided to embark on taking a new critical look at modern thought itself. I learned from my critique that modernity itself is by no means always rational and reasonable; irrational ideas and non-worldly proclivities going back to medieval times are alive and well within modern thought.

This leads us next to consider what sort of age was “early modern”—sandwiched as it is between medieval and modern. With the advent of the modern age, the need to assert new values of the age led to a strong tendency to emphasize the break with the past and portray early modern thought and religion in negative terms. In contrast, some researchers have appreciated some aspects of early modern thought as they pioneered or laid the groundwork for modern thought. Thus, while heretofore comparisons of early modern and modern thought have tended to emphasize either discontinuity or continuity, both perspectives, after all, take modern thought as their standard of appraisal.

Early modern thought was not only different from that of medieval times but founded on ideas distinct from those of modern times as well. In comparison to medieval times, during the early modern period secularization progressed and the sphere of the worldly greatly expanded. Despite such developments, however, the realm concealed behind such ideas cannot be simply denied as if it did not exist. It has been thought that the early modern period was an age of Confucianism while Buddhism had gone into decline. That assessment, however, is mistaken, and in fact Buddhism did

服して、実質的に徳川主導で政治運営を目指す目的で推進されたのが入内戦略であり、徳川系天皇の擁立であった。大坂の陣によって豊臣家は滅びたが、徳川幕府は西国問題とより直接的に向き合わねばならなくなり、天皇制の意義はより深まることとなる。

以下、武家諸法度、大名の改易と転封、鎖国と参勤交代といった著名な政治制度についても、これらの新しい分析視角を導入することによって従来の認識を一変していく所以を論じた。

(原文：日本語)

思想史の中の近世

末木文美士 (名誉教授)

私は中世の仏教思想を専門としている。ところが、中世の研究を進めるうちに分かったことは、長い間、中世研究は近代の視点からなされてきたことである。即ち、中世の中に近代的な合理主義に合致したところがあると、高く評価するが、それに合わないと否定的に見られた。それは甚だおかし。そこで、私は近代の思想を批判的に見直すことに着手した。そうしてみると、近代も決して合理主義だけでなく、その裏に中世以来の非合理的で、非現世的な発想が生きていることが分かってきた。

そうなると、中世と近代の間に挟まった近世とは、どのような時代なのか、検討が必要となる。近代になって、その新しさを主張するために、近世との断絶を強調し、近世の思想や宗教を否定的に見る傾向が強かった。それに対して、一部の研究者は、近世にも近代の先駆となる思想があった点を高く評価した。このように、近世を近代と較べて、断絶を強調するか、連続を強調するかのいずれかであったが、どちらも近世を近代の基準で見ている。

しかし、近世は中世と異なると同時に、近代とも異なる独自の発想を基盤としていた。近世は中世と異なり、世俗化が進み、現世的な領域が大きくなった。しかし、それは直ちに背後の隠れた世界を否定することにはならない。従来、近世は儒教の時代で、仏教は衰退したと考えられてきたが、それは誤りで、実際には仏教も大きな力を