

戦国大名島津氏の領国支配と権力構造

大山, 智美

<https://hdl.handle.net/2324/1500437>

出版情報：九州大学, 2014, 博士（比較社会文化）, 論文博士
バージョン：
権利関係：やむを得ない事由により本文ファイル非公開（3）

氏 名 : 大山 智美

論文題名 : 戦国大名島津氏の領国支配と権力構造

区 分 : 乙

論 文 内 容 の 要 旨

本論は、薩摩・大隅・日向三ヶ国を支配した戦国大名島津氏の領国支配と権力構造について、序章で大きく三つの課題を設定し、Ⅲ部7章にわたり具体的に検討し、終章で総括を行った。

第Ⅰ部では、三ヶ国守護職を保有する島津本宗家の家督継承争いを検証し、戦国大名島津氏の権力構造を解明することを課題とした。

第Ⅰ部第1章では、島津氏の場合、守護職は、鎌倉期(13世紀)以来、本宗家家督継承において所領や島津荘地頭職等とともに譲与されており、家産の一つという認識だったことを明らかにした。そのため本宗家家督が守護職の地位にあり、家督権限によって家督から御一家(近親者かつ有力庶家)への守護職権限の委任や悔返(譲与や契約を取り消すこと)も、長年行われていた。また家督権限をもって本宗家家督が悔返を繰り返したことにより、悔い返された側である御一家の遺恨・鬱憤が募っていたことが島津氏内の家督継承争いの本質だったことも指摘した。その結果、先行研究が指摘したような守護職権限の移動=家督継承ではないこと、島津氏内には家督継承争いの主導権を握る御一家や家中内の一揆的結合がないこと、家督に対して結束しているとされた御一家内も対立していたことを明らかにした。

第Ⅰ部第2章及び補論では、これまで実力によって家督継承を果たしたとされてきた御一家の一つ相州家島津貴久は、本宗家相続順にもとづき本宗家家督・守護職を継承したことを明らかにした。その一方で、貴久は、室町幕府からの家督継承の正式な追認(=官途拝領)までの間、長年の大隅国守護代制を廃止し、家督による直接的な領国支配体制への転換を意図していたことを指摘した。また、要港山川を領する国衆頼娃氏及び種子島氏を通じて海上輸送された屋久島の材木や、種子島に伝来した最新武器鉄炮も、官途拝領前後の場面において国衆統制を示す指標として効果的に政治利用した。さらに、領国内の大寺社を再興することで、貴久が家督を継承したことをアピールし、再興の真の立役者である後見役の日新(貴久父)の神格化によって、貴久による領国支配を宗教的側面から補完することも意図されていたことを指摘した。

第Ⅱ部では、戦国大名島津氏の領国支配体制の基盤である地頭衆中制(地頭=支城の代官、衆中=支城におかれた軍団。血縁・地縁的結合を主とした戦国大名の軍団編成である寄親寄子制の一形態)について、交通統制策や給地・公役面から再検討し実態を解明することを課題とした。

第Ⅱ部第3章では、交通統制策の検討から、外城制(支城制)と地頭が、通行管理や夫役徴収といった陸上交通統制の面でも有効に機能していたことを明らかにした。一方、水上交通統制においては、これまで地頭の支配下とされてきた領国内の要港と廻船衆を、島津氏が直接把握していたことを指摘した。

第Ⅱ部第4章では、島津氏領国支配における権力基盤であった地頭衆中制が確立したとされる天正初期(1570年代)段階では、地頭も衆中も自己の所領を経営する小領主の性格が強く、給地(役職分の恩給地)が不足していた実態を明らかにした。その解決策のため島津氏は領国拡大を図っていた

が、豊臣政権への降伏と領国縮小で再び給地不足に陥り、地頭・衆中が大きな不満を抱えていたことを指摘した。これにより、地頭・衆中の在地性（在地領主制）の喪失の契機を何にみるかという先行研究の議論に対し、給地不足解決のために、地頭は鹿児島へ集住し、衆中は在地役人となった階層分化が進み、在地性は否定されるのではなく変容を遂げるという見解を示した。

第Ⅲ部では、戦国大名島津氏と従属関係とされた三ヶ国外の国衆との支配関係を解明することを課題とした。

第Ⅲ部第5章では、戦国大名島津氏が三ヶ国外の戦国大名・国衆と結んだ「幕下（ばっか）」関係を検討し、島津氏を盟主と推戴する緩やかな軍事的盟約関係であることを明らかにした。先行研究のように「幕下」関係の国衆は島津氏の家臣団とはみなせないことを指摘した。

第Ⅲ部第6章及び補論では、島津氏が肥後国支配の踏襲モデルとした戦国大名大友氏も、国衆の自立性を認める統治方式をとっていたことを明らかにした。大友氏と肥後国衆合志氏の関係を軍事面・経済面から分析した。その結果、軍事面では同心制（寄親寄子制の一形態）を基盤とする緩やかな重層の関係であり、流通・経済面でも関や座（商人の同業組合）の管理などにおいて同様の関係であることを明らかにした。

第Ⅲ部第7章では、肥後国衆一揆について再検討した結果、豊臣秀吉は国衆に対し、本領からの部分安堵とし、その目録作成のために指出（領地面積の申告）を命じていたことが判明した。これにより、秀吉が肥後国主佐々成政に検地不施行の原則を命じたという「太閤記」を典拠とする従来の通説を覆した。秀吉は、国衆を成政のもとに与力編成することで主従関係を確立して、国衆が行使していた検地権を撰取しようとしていた。これは、三ヶ国外の国衆に対し自立性を認めた島津氏と比べ、強い姿勢といえた。つまり肥後国衆一揆は、通説のような成政に対する反抗ではなく、検地反対も含む豊臣政権に対する反抗だったこと指摘した。

本論の成果から、島津本宗家家督は、「家」の保有する職＝島津荘地頭職等の所職と三ヶ国守護職という、「国」支配＝三ヶ国支配の根拠を二重に有していた。つまり、島津氏の場合、三ヶ国支配の根拠を世襲する本宗家家督が非常に強い権限をもつ権力構造だった。さらに、本宗家を継承した御一家相州家は、家督による直接支配体制に転換し、戦国大名化を遂げた。本論は、中世後期の日本では、室町幕府の直轄区域とは異なった地方の政治体制が共存し、変容しながら近世まで存続していたことを裏付ける意義をもつと考える。

Sengoku Daimyo Shimazu Family: Its Country Rule and Power Structure

Tomomi OOOYAMA

Summary:

This paper examines the state of the country rule and power structure of the Shimazu family, a sengoku daimyo that ruled three provinces of Satsuma, Osumi and Hyuga in the Sengoku period. In the introduction, three major tasks are established, which are discussed in detail in seven chapters in three parts, and the overview is given in the final chapter.

For Part I, the task is set to examine the fight for the headship of the Shimazu family that held the Syugo-shiki or governor title over the three provinces and to clarify the power structure of the sengoku daimyo Shimazu family.

Chapter 1 in Part I clarifies that the Shimazu family recognized the Syugo-shiki title as one of the properties of the Shimazu family, since the title had been bequeathed to the newly ascended head along with the family's domain and Jitou or manager's title for Shimazu-no-sho since the Kamakura period (13th century). Being in the position of the Syugo-shiki, the head of the Shimazu Family with his headship authority delegated the power of Syugo-shiki to the Goikka or close relatives and influential cadet branches, and exercised kuikaeshi to revoke such delegated power for many years. The chapter points out that the repeated kuikaeshi by the head of the family based on its authority caused anger and resentment to escalate on the side of the Goikka to whom such kuikaeshi was directed, which was the very nature of the fight for succession of the family headship in the Shimazu Family. Consequently, the chapter also clarifies that the transfer of the power of Syugo-shiki did not equate the succession of the family headship as earlier studies have indicated, that the Goikka and those within the family that were said to have led the fight for the family headship in the Shimazu family were not united as seen in an ikki, and that there was hostility among the Goikka that had been thought to be united against the family headship.

Chapter 2, Part I and addendum clarify that Shimazu Takahisa of Sosyuke, one of the Goikka, who had been thought to have won the family headship on his own merit, had indeed inherited the Syugo-shiki title and the headship of the family based on the lines of succession in the family. Also pointed out is that Takahisa intended to abolish the Syugo-dai or deputy Syugo system in the Osumi province that lasted for many years and to shift to the direct country rule by the family head while waiting for the formal ratification of the succession (acceptance of the rank) by the Muromachi shogunate. He demonstrated the control of the Kunishu or local lower-class lords before and after the acceptance of the rank, by politically utilizing timbers from Yakushima Island shipped through kunishu Ei family that held the key port Yamagawa and Tanegashima family as well as matchlock guns, new weaponry that was introduced to the Tanegashima Island. The chapter also points out that the reconstruction of large temples and shrines in the country was to signal the succession of the family by Takahisa and to complement Takahisa's country rule from the religion aspect through the deification of his guardian Jisshin (Takahisa's father) who was the real leader in the

reconstruction.

Part II's task is to reexamine and unravel the Jitou-syutyu system, which was the foundation of the country rule by the sengoku daimyo Shimazu family, from the aspects of traffic control as well as Kyuchi or granted land and Kuyaku or imposed labor or taxes. The Jitou-syutyu system consisted of Jitou, a manager of the Tojyo (shijyo or branch castle), and Syutyu, an army of the Tojyo. It was one form of Yorioya-yoriko system, a military formation used by sengoku daimyo based on blood or territorial connections emulating a parent and child relationship.

Chapter 3 Part II clarifies that the Tojyo administrative unit system and Jitou functioned effectively in controlling land traffic and passages and buyaku or imposing labor, based on the examination of their traffic control policies. It is also pointed out that in terms of marine traffic control, the Shimazu family had the direct hold on the important ports and kaisen-shyu or workers for cargo vessels in the domain, which had been considered to be under the Jitou's control.

Chapter 4, Part II looks into the Jitou-syutyu system that was the power base for the Shimazu family's country rule. The system was thought to have been established in the early Tensyo period in the 1570s. However, the Jitou and Syutyu were more of small-scale lords that managed their own domains around that time and there was a deficiency in kyuchi or granted land for a job. This chapter points out that the Shimazu family attempted to remedy the situation by expanding its territory; however the surrender to the Toyotomi administration and territory reduction led to inadequacy in kyuchi, and caused the Jitou and Syutyu discontent. There are preceding studies that addressed the cause of loss of the characteristics as local lords in Jitou and Syutyu. This chapter offers a view that such characteristics was not negated but transformed due to insufficient kyuchi, with Jitou collectively settling in Kagoshima and Syutyu becoming local officials, furthering hierarchization.

The task for Part III is to clarify the master-subordinate relationship between the sengoku daimyo Shimazu family and the kunisyu in the territory other than the three provinces, who were thought to be in the vassal relationship with the family.

Chapter 5 Part III looks into the bakka or master-subordinate relationship entered between the sengoku daimyo Shimazu family and the sengoku daimyo and kunishu outside of the three provinces, and clarifies the bakka to be a loose military treaty with the Shimazu family held as the leader. The chapter points out that the kunishu in the bakka relationship could not be considered as vassals of the Shimazu family as suggested by the earlier studies.

Chapter 6 in Part III and addendum clarify that the Otomo family, a sengoku daimyo the Shimazu family used as a model for ruling the Higo province, also had adopted the governance method of allowing the independence of the kunishu. The relationship between the Otomo family and Higo kunishu Koushi family

was analyzed from the military and economic viewpoints. The analysis revealed that it was a relaxed multi-layered relationship based on the Doshin system (a form of Yorioya-yoriko system) in the military aspect, and in terms of distribution and economy, it was a similar relationship in the management of trade associations such as seki and za.

Chapter 7 Part III reexamined the Kunishu-ikki in Higo Province. It became clear that Toyotomi Hideyoshi decided to offer kunishu only a partial Ando or partial guaranteeing of their territories, and had ordered the Sashidashi or declaration of territory size in order to create a Mokuroku. This finding overturns the prevailing theory based on the “Taikouki” that Hideyoshi had ordered the governor Sassa Narimasa of Higo province not to carry out kenchi or cadastral survey. Hideyoshi intended to establish the vassal relationship by placing the kunishu under Narimasa and to take away the right of kenchi exercised by the kunishu. This was a much firmer stance compared to that of the Shimazu family, which was to allow independence to the kunishu in the provinces other than Satsuma, Osumi and Hyuga. Thereby the chapter points out that the Kunishu-ikki in Higo Province was not a rebellion against Narimasa as commonly accepted, but a rebellion against the Toyotomi administration including the objection to kenchi.

The discussions in this paper deduce that the head of the Shimazu family had the dual legitimacy for ruling the “kuni” or country (three provinces), with the legitimacy being based on the Shyosiki or job titles such as Jitou of the Shimazu-no-sho that the “ie” or family had held and the Syugo-shiki title for the three provinces of Satsuma, Osumi and Hyuga. In other words, the Shimazu family had the power structure that bestowed vast authority to the head of the family, who inherited the legitimacy to rule the three provinces. After Sosyuke, one of the Goikka, acceded to the head family of Shimazu, they switched to the governance system that enabled the direct control by the head of the family and the family became a sengoku daimyo. The paper believes that Japan in the late medieval period is significant in that it allowed the coexistence of various local political systems different from that in the areas under the direct control of the Muromachi shogunate, which transformed and survived until the early modern period.