

論文の英文要旨

| | |
|------|--|
| 論文題目 | The basic study related to the <i>daimyo kaieki</i> (attainder) in Edo period - Attempt the reconsideration of the Tokugawa shogun`s power- |
| 氏名 | ヤン イクモ 梁 益模 (YANG IKMO) |

It is a study is mainly about the *daimyo's kaieki* (attainder) which is one of the punishments from the Shogunate to the *shogun and daimyo's* power structure in the Edo Shogunate.

In the former study the disposal of confiscated estate of the Shogunate's *daimyo* was defined as the *kaieki*. From the entire Edo period there were 248 *daimyo kaieki* so it is defined as the strongest control of the Shogunate's *daimyo* restrictions.

However, according to the Shogunate' law, *kaieki* does not mean confiscated estate from feudal lords but a social position punishment that deprives warriors' social position and a confiscated estate is known to be recorded as pecuniary punishment that completely took away the land that the *daimyo* possessed or took some parts of the land.

In the former study to change the developed relationship between the shogun and *daimyo* (the shogun power's proposition) because of the changed definition of *kaieki*, first there needs to be complete understanding of the definition and there needs to be a reexamination of the former incidents that were thought to be *kaieki* and to draw questions about the shogun power's proposition.

First, in the first chapter we presented the problems of the former study. In the 2nd and the 3rd chapters we analyzed a major *Tokugawa Jikki*(True Tokugawa Record) and Edo Bakufu Nikki(Edo Shogunate Journals) and researched how the *daimyo's* the disposal of confiscated estate was recorded in the Shogunate. In the results, there weren't any presentations of the *kaieki* as taking away the *daimyo's* land only 5 incidents and we knew that the incidents presented as *kaieki* were all *hatamoto* status. Also it can be

called a characteristic that after the confiscated estate, *daimyo* still could keep their positions as warriors and the *daimyo* could continue the 'ie' that is household unit of social organization.

In the 4th chapter we looked at the documents to see if there were any *daimyo* presented as *kaieki* rather than Shogunate called *kaieki*. In the results, we found out that the word *kaieki* was tried to be hidden in the Shogunate because of its big social impact and we found that *daimyo* was also used in personal documents.

In the 5th and the 6th chapters we looked at special incident *Yonezawa Domain Uesugike, Matsumoto Domain Mizunoke* and found out that rather than having the Shogunate trying to cut off the *Daimyoke*, but tried hard to continue with them.

From this analysis we could find two things to challenge. First, *kaieki* was a punishment for *hatamoto* status rather than *daimyos*. In addition, instead of having Shogunate punish the *daimyo* with *kaieki* they used a pay cut to continue with *Daimyoke* or continuation of *ie* or family by *hatamotoke*. These challenges bring to conclusion that the relationship between the shogun and *daimyo* were not having one over another but Shogunate tried to continue their relationship with the *Daimyoke* to keep the helping relationship by mutual relation.