# The *Hinin* Associations in Osaka, 1600-1868

CHRISTIAN M. HERMANSEN

## Abstract

The pre-modern Japanese society was made up of status groups, and among those of lowest regard was one called *hinin*. People who ended up as *hinin* were marginalized, yet in the early modern period their life was as well regulated as the rest of society. The focus of this article is on the organization of registered *hinin* in Osaka from 1600 to 1868. It will demonstrate how the hierarchical structuration influenced the *hinin* community, and it will argue that the organization of *hinin* gradually gave them power also over the authorities, so an observer by the middle of the nineteenth century could ask whether the organized *hinin* and the *hinin* 'living under the barns'[1] were indeed the same sort of people, and conclude that he did not think so.

## Introduction

The theme of marginalization in modern Japanese society usually directs our attention towards groups such as the Ainu people, people of recent Korean descent, and the descendants of a status group that existed in Japan's early modern period (c. 1600-1868) and was labelled 'much polluted' (*eta*[2]). The descendants themselves are called *burakumin*. (In English see, for example, Weiner 1997.)

In 1691 (Genroku 4) Osaka city magistrates were faced with the problem of what to do with about 1,268 unregistered

persons who had been rounded up in the city. It decided to buy a tract of land from the appointed roof-tile master, Terajima Tôemon. The tract was called Southern Tile Clay Gathering Place and was located between Osaka Castle and Shitennôji temple. On that land the city magistrates had 123 huts constructed, each measuring less than three square metres, to house the unregistered people. The actual administration of the houses and the people was handed over to the local *hinin* association, called the 'Four Places' (*Shikasho*) or the 'Association' (*nakama*), which received, along with the order, a sum of 2,160 *me* of silver. The association set up an office near the huts from which they continued to administer their charges in the Four Places under their control through the remaining part of the early modern period, ending in 1868 (*Ôsaka machibugyô kannai yôran* 1985: 80; see also OSS I: 500).[3] One notes with Professor Uchida that the huts could not possibly have housed that many people (Uchida 1991: 852).

## Status and Inequality in the Early Modern Period

The Japanese society of the early modern period was highly hierarchical, and the differentiation was codified, propped up by religious and philosophical ideas of the day, and sustained by norms of status appropriate to conduct at all levels of that society. As any modern textbook on Japanese history will be sure to mention, the majority of the population belonged to one of four status groups (*mibun*): warrior scholar (or gentleman), peasant, artisan or merchant, in Japanese *shi-nô-kô-shô*. Outside and above these groups were the imperial family, the courtiers and the Buddhist and Shinto clergy. All the groups mentioned so far constituted the 'good people' (*ryômin*). Outside and below the four status groups were the 'base people' (*senmin*), the majority of whom belonged to one of two status groups 'much polluted' or 'non-humans' – in Japanese *eta* and *hinin*.[4] It was the logic of this system that within any of the status groups the individual and his family had a rank. The rank would have as great an impact on his daily life.

The Meiji restoration of 1868 is usually said to mark the end of the early modern period in Japan. As the restoration gained momentum and more political effort was invested into modernizinge Japan in the image of the Western industrializing countries of the day, a new legislation was promulgated in 1871 formally abolishing discrimination. A new kind of status system was introduced and so was a family registration system that included a record of the status of the registrant. In this registration the former 'much polluted' category of people were called 'new commoners' (*shin heimin*).

Due to this modern situation, most academic studies on historic discrimination in Japan have naturally focused on the 'much polluted'. Archives have been established in many places in Japan to document and enable research on the living conditions of the 'much polluted'. Most attention has been focused on the situation in Edo, today's Tokyo, where the head of 'much polluted' in that area, Danzaemon, was head of all the 'base' people. However, important as Edo was, the situation there should not be considered representative of all of Japan, neither in the case of the marginalized nor in other matters (cf. Yoshida 1999: 165-166).

To appreciate the nuances of the marginalized people, it is the intention here to enhance our understanding of the life of another part of the 'base' people by looking at the *hinin* and their association in Osaka.

This article focuses on how the *hinin* were organized and on the services they provided as guards and police assistants assigned to the *hinin* association in Osaka. The study of the rules and regulations pertaining to those services will in turn show how the authorities sought to strengthen their control not only over 'loose' elements otherwise deemed difficult to control, but also over 'ordinary' citizens. Since appellation was extremely significant in the early modern period, we will also suggest that the organized *hinin* were partially successful in their attempt to change the surrounding society's appellation of them from '*hinin*' to 'associates' or '*kaito*'.

### Hinin – 'non-human' – beggar

The history of *hinin* in Osaka during the early modern period (1600-1868) is a story about power. In that age, *hinin* was a status ascribed to a variety of people who were depended upon but still marginalized within society at large. The status group included some of the poor, the sick, those who had nowhere else to turn, but also street entertainers, actors, descendants of Christians (*korobi kirishitan*), some master-less samurai (*rônin*) and criminals. In other words, these were people or groups of people whom the authorities wanted to keep under control and who did not fit into any of the other categories to which most members of society belonged. There were two sources for the concept of *hinin*.

First, in 1603 the Jesuits published their Dictionary of the Japanese Language. Their entry on *hinin* simply read 'Finin: Madoxij fito. *Homem pobre*' [*Vocabvlario da Linguoa Iapam* 1960: 181). The entry pertains to the word written with Chinese characters that literally translates as 'non-human', a point to which we shall return later. It indicates that the contemporary use of the word first of all denigrated the social condition of the person thus indicated, i.e. a 'poor person'. This assumption finds support in the dictionary's entry on the almost homonymous word *hinnin*, which means 'poor person'. It reads 'Finnin. i, Finin. *Pobre*' (*Vocabvlario* 1960: 694) where 'i,' means 'i.e.'.

Second, as just mentioned, the word *hinin* is also the Sino-Japanese translation of the Buddhist Sanskrit term *amanusya* which means 'no man' in the sense of 'outside the human realm', where 'human' refers to the society of lay people. (On *hinin* see *Nihon kokugo daijiten* 1975: vol. XVII, p. 80, and Nakamura 1975: 1126, 3rd row. On *amanusya* see Monier-Williams 1964: 80.)

### Hinin in early modern Japan

As scholarship on the poor in Europe has long pointed out, 'poor' means different things at different places, and even

different things at the same place at different times (cf. Jütte 1994). The same is true in the case of *hinin* in Japan.

From the seventeenth through to the nineteenth century, the word *hinin* had at least three meanings. As mentioned above, it was the name of one of the contemporary social status categories and of those who belonged to that category, whether by birth or due to social circumstances. But sometimes *hinin* was used as a reference to those otherwise known as *mushuku nohinin* (or *nobinin*), 'field non-humans without abode'. Today *mushuku* means homeless, but a *nohinin* could have a place to stay, but he was not recorded in a register of religious affiliation, and that was a grave offence in those days. Finaly *hinin* was used to indicate anyone who lived by begging, although such persons were also called *kojiki*.

Whatever the situation, a *hinin* was regarded as a person of low social value whose existence depended on the generosity of his surroundings. In exchange for a small donation in kind or money, the *hinin* often performed some kind of entertainment or a service, if able to do so. Of course, seen from the *hinin*'s perspective, it was the other way round – first performing, then, perhaps, a donation.

As this article will show, some *hinin*, in the sense of being a person with *hinin* status, eventually managed to organize themselves as a group, partly on their own initiative and partly on the instructions of the authorities. In this way they managed to use their organization to acquire certain rights and a monopoly for some types of income, which probably made life a little more tolerable. Yet even when the organization, by the end of the early modern period, had turned its services into a regular work performed in exchange for a fixed amount of money and goods, it did not manage to shed the pejorative label from its group.

Obviously many themes and topics could and should be studied in relation to *hinin* in the early modern period, but here we will limit ourselves and return to the question of power. In the case of the *hinin* in Osaka, power was brought into the equation at the following levels: (a) within the *hinin* association; (b) among the association members and the 'not registered

*hinin'*; (c) between the socially marginalized groups in general; and (d) between authorities at all levels and their subjects in general, but especially those who did not fit into any of the respectable categories.

## *Hinin* in Osaka

Before going into details on the registered *hinin* in Osaka and their work, we need briefly to outline the early modern history and organization of the city of Osaka.

### Osaka

The foundation of modern Osaka was laid when Toyotomi Hideyoshi (1534-1598) decided to have a castle built on the ruins of the Ishiyama Honganji temple in 1583. Ishiyama Honganji had been one of the sternest enemies of Oda Nobunaga (1532-1582) in his conquest of Japan and throughout the 1570s it resisted his siege. However, shortly after it surrendered in 1580 it burned down (McClain and Wakita 1999: 11).

Hideyoshi instructed his allies to set up residence near his new castle and the town evolved west of the castle towards the sea, and south of it towards Shitennôji, located some 3 kilometres south of the castle. As part of the development several canals were dug to facilitate transportation. Osaka became the central market for tax rice.

Only 30 years after its construction, Osaka Castle burned down in 1615 after a siege by Tokugawa Ieyasu and his army. With the defeat, Osaka lost its national political importance, but in order to keep the supporters of Hideyoshi under control, the shôgun appointed a 'Lord of Osaka Castle' (*Ôsaka jôshu*). Osaka remained the central exchange of tax rice and this gave the city its nickname of 'Kitchen of the World' (*Tenka no daidokoro*) (Wakita 1994: 12-31).

Osaka became the administrative centre for west Japan, and one of Japan's biggest cities. The merchant and artisan population rose from 268,768 in 1665 (Kanbun 5), peaked at 419,863 in 1766 (Meiwa 3), and then declined to 281,306 in 1868 (Meiji 1).

(OSS I: 371, 880 and II: 758)[5] Although these figures are not all-inclusive, they give us a fair idea of the population's size and demographic tendencies during the period.

### The wards

To manage so many people, an elaborate administrative hierarchy evolved. From top to bottom it consisted of the castle warden and the city magistrates (of whom there were two) with their respective offices and a small group of soldiers. The warden as well as the magistrates were appointed by the Tokugawa rulers. Further down the ladder came the three districts, North, South and Tenma, each with a district leader, and his office. The diestrict leader was elected among the full-fledged townspeople, i.e. those who possessed land. Each district covered a number of wards, the total of which changed through the period, but in 1665 they numbered 549. Most of the inhabitants were townspeople (*chônin*) in a broad sense of the word, i.e. people living in the town and belonging to one of the two status groups of artisans or merchants. However, in a narrow legal sense only those who owned property in a ward held the rights and obligations of townspeople. These rights included the eligibility for positions such as ward elder (*machidoshiyori*) while participation in the 'self-guarding' of the ward (*jishinban*) was among the obligations.[6]

The wards made internal agreements in order to regulate the day-to-day life. (For examples see OSS V: 213-245, or Miyamoto 1985, and especially 'Ôsaka no machi shikimoku' [Ward agreements in Osaka] 1991.) The position as ward elder was not salaried in Osaka. They received donations on a number of occasions, but most of them did not give up their profession. To handle the daily businesses of the ward, an intendant (*chôdai*) was employed and in the later years of the early modern period also a secretary located in the ward's meeting place (*kaisho*).

Despite the 'local' nature of the ward and district leaders and the 'national' nature of the magistrates and castle warden, when it came to security, their interests were apparently in harmony. At least the wards seem to have agreed with the city

magistrates that gambling and unregistered people were threats
to security.

Several means were employed to guard against those threats.
Besides the city magistrates' 'police' and the wards' 'self-guard-
ing' units (*jishin ban*), four other kinds of guards were orga-
nized: the 'night guard' (*yo ban*), the 'ward gate guard' (*machi
kido ban*), the 'street hairdressers' (*toko kamiyui*), and the '*kaito*
guard' (*kaito ban*). Here we will focus on the registered *hinin*'s
role in security affairs, first of all as '*kaito* guard' but also as
assistants to the city magistrates' police.

### Functions

When we look at society's use of the *hinin* status, it appears to
have served two purposes. First, as a means of control over
members who otherwise were perceived as a potential threat to
public order. Second, as a safe haven for those who had no-
where else to seek support in their daily lives.

In its latter capacity it was a continuation of what *hinin* had
been prior to the early modern period, and a continuation of the
intention behind the institution of *hiden'in*. As such it is com-
parable to local efforts in early modern European cities to
relieve the deserving poor (Jütte 1994).

In its former capacity, it was something new in Japanese
history. There are earlier examples in Japanese history where
convicts were given an alternative to punishment, if they
agreed to serve the police judge of the Heian court, a position
known as *hômen*. But that position only existed in the capital
and evolved into formal title not necessarily filled with con-
victs, so neither in number nor nature does it compare with the
early modern *hinin*'s function as guards or police assistants.
(Sasayama 1991). The *hinin* group in Osaka comprised roughly
1 per cent of the city's population, and their functions as guards
and policing assistants were duties, or privileges, of that group.
This was also the case in other places of Japan, for example
Nara, and several villages.

Through these assignments the controllers (i.e. the authori-
ties) made the controlled (i.e. the *hinin*) control: (1) themselves
by the regulations and rules their organization stipulated, (2)

the wards or villages they worked in, or patrolled through and (3) uncontrollable elements in society, especially those who were not registered.

### The four *kaito* – the *hinin* settlements

Most of the registered *hinin* in Osaka lived in one of the four designated areas known as *kaito* (lit. 'outside the walls'), located just outside the city and in the vicinity of a religious institution. The oldest document relating to the *kaito* of Osaka dates from 1644 (Kan'ei 21st). This explains that it has not been possible to return the 80 male and female *hinin* (*kojiki*) in Dôtonbori to their places of origin; that they are ready to serve at any time, and that their leader (the *chôri*) has been instructed to investigate strictly for apostate Christians (*korobi kirishitan*) (DH I: 1-2). It was a similar problem with unreturnable people that caused the construction of 123 huts in 1691, and which had caused a distribution of several hundred persons in 1684. (On the case of 1684, see DH I: 25.)

The four *kaito* were collectively known as 'The Four Places' (*Shikasho*) or the 'Association' (*nakama*).[7] *Hinin* lived in a few other settlements as well, but they were subordinates of one of the *kaito*. The four *kaito* were:

- **Hiden'in** (a Buddhist term 'Hall of the Field of Grief'), originally a part of the Shitennôji temple and under the jurisdiction of Tennôji village. In the early modern period, the inhabitants of Hiden'in claimed their Hall to be as old as the temple itself, which would date its origin to the late 590s (HM nos 1-5, HM: 23-33). This cannot be confirmed. The oldest reference to a hiden'in at Shitennôji is *'Arahakadera engi'* (The Records on the Origin of Arahaka Temple [= Shitennôji]) possibly written in 1007 (Inoue Kaoru 1985: KDJ 6: 906). In 1274 the Buddhist priest Nishô constructed two retreats for the destitute who had gathered at Shitennôji in order to beg from the pilgrims who visited the temple (McClain and Wakita 1999: 8). In the early modern period Hiden'in lay south of Shitennôji

by the Abeno road, which leads from the temple to the Sumiyoshitaisha Shintô shrine.

- **Tobita** lay near one of Osaka's five graveyards and a place of execution. It had branched off Hiden'in, and it was also under the jurisdiction of Tennôji village.

- **Dôtonbori** or **Sennichi** *kaito* was positioned next to another of the graveyards and opposite a place for execution. It came under the jurisdiction of the Shimo Naniwa village. All three *kaito* mentioned so far were located south of Osaka city.

- **Tenma** was the fourth *kaito*, located near the graveyard at Yoshiwara. It was under the jurisdiction of Kawasaki village, north of the city.

The importance of the location of the *kaito* is two-fold. First, as their common name indicates, they were literally situated outside the city's walls, albeit not very far from them, and placed under the administration and jurisdiction of a village. As we shall see shortly, the *hinin* were almost completely dependent on the city yet physically they were not a part of it.[8] In the cases of Hiden'in and Tobita, they were also under the jurisdiction of the temple Shitennôji, as far as one may judge from the documents in *Hiden'in Monjo*. In the case of the Dôton Canal settlement, many of the documents in *Dotonbori hinin kankei monjo* (abbrev. DH) are reports signed by the village head and therefore illustrate well the dependency and administration under which the *hinin* lived. The physical separation of the *hinin* from the city was unlike the situations in Edo and Kyoto, where the *hinin* settlements lay within the boundaries of the cities.

There is a second, more morbid reason for the choice of location. Three of the *kaito* were located near cemeteries and in two cases next to a ground for executions. This nearness to places associated with death, in a society that held death to be highly polluting, underlined the concept of *hinin* as people to be avoided. Indeed, the society believed in isolating temporarily those who had been polluted; the length of isolation depending on the degree of pollution. We may add that it also related well

to the Buddhist idea of *hinin* as persons who have renounced (= left) the mundane world of human beings, since that is what the dead have done: as evidenced by the Japanese Buddhist custom of giving the dead a posthumous Buddha name.

Together, these two points support the impression of city planning that aimed at keeping those of similar rank together. At the centre of the city was the castle, representing the centre of power, and so distance from the centre became a literal measure of power – the further from the centre one was, the less power one wielded. So the *hinin* were near dead and almost without power.

### Organization of the registered *hinin*

While some registered *hinin* lived outside the Four Places, all of them, by being registered, belonged to the *hinin* hierarchy, the Association (*nakama*), which was headed by the leaders of the Four Places. In order to understand the *hinin*'s work as guards, it is necessary to sketch out two levels of organization – within each *kaito* and among the *kaito*.

Like the surrounding society, the *kaito* had its classes of people and the most simple distinction was the dipole of rulers and ruled. The rulers included: one leader (*chôri*), occasionally one second-in-command (*nirô*),[9] headmen (*kumigashira*) and assistant headmen (*kogashira*). The ruled included the *waka-kimono* (lit. 'youngster,' but here it means 'rank-and-file member' or 'private' to keep up with the military jargon) and apprentices (*deshi*) (Okamoto and Uchida 1976: 508-511)[10] Space does not permit elaboration of the finer details of office, but it is worth noting that the position as leader and second-in-command were hereditary. This sometimes resulted in a minor being appointed when his father had passed away early in his childhood (DH I: 50).

The registration records of the *hinin* were entered into a register kept by the village but kept separate from that of the other villagers. Likewise, all activities of the *kaito* had to be approved or at least recorded by the village head and reported by him to the city magistrates of Osaka. Such records form the major part of *Dôtonbori hinin kankei monjo*.

Outside the Four Places there were three other smaller settlements of *hinin* named Bishamon, Sunaba and Takahara. They were headed by one or more assistant headmen.

Among the Four Places several kinds of connections such as marriage or adoptions but also formalized relations were made to ensure co-operation. The four leaders (*chôri*) were as a group held responsible for the management of *hinin* affairs *vis-à-vis* the wards and the city magistrates. The co-operation and responsibility were manifest in their communal office at Takahara from which they organized the guard services and customary begging (see below). When a member of the *hinin* association came into conflict with his own leader, he could appeal to the Takahara office for understanding and help. (See for example HM no. 141, HM: 162-189, especially pp. 172 ff.) In 1773 the city magistrates consented to a suggestion from the wards to rationalize the treatment of unfortunate travellers who had fallen ill in the streets of Osaka, all the more so if the traveller was a beggar, so a kind of infirmary was set up next to the gaol at Takahara. The Four Places were put in charge of the institution[11] (OSS III: 821-824).

## Work as guard

The work for *hinin* as guards (*kaitoban*) invites study from several different points of view, i.e. those of the parties involved. The best documented viewpoints are those of the wards, the *hinin* leadership and the city magistrates, whereas the very interesting perspective of the guards themselves is poorly documented. A picture of how they worked may be drawn from the information presented by the other three parties, but we have as yet to find indications of how they saw themselves. On a more abstract level, a closer look at the *kaito* guard may give a clearer picture of the interaction among the more powerful of the parties involved, and this in turn should contribute to our knowledge of their struggle for control.

In the brief outline of the organization of the wards in Osaka presented above, it was mentioned that they had to organize their own guard to protect themselves, and the city, from dangers posed by fires and thieves. Other threats to security

took the form of abandoned children and strangers who fell ill in the streets, because the ward in which such persons were found, and in fact the house in front of which they were found, was obliged by the city's regulations to take care of the person until his or her recovery. The '_kaito_ guard' (_kaitoban_) was a part of the ward-protection scheme. In the daily life of the ward another important function of the _kaito_ guard was to keep _hinin_ away from the ward. From the standpoint of the Four Places, the _kaito_ guard served as a way to acquire donations at both regular and occasional events. Moreover the organization of the _kaito_ guard was one way for the _hinin_ leaders to exercise control of their ranks and secure their own position.

### History

It is not clear from the sources when the _kaito_ guarding service was institutionalized. The oldest document in _Hiden'in monjo_ which mentions it dates from 1762 (HM no. 94, HM: 117-118). The institution must have been older still, however, and the need for its kind of work could date back to the time when the new 'registration by faith' (_shûmon aratame ninbetsu chô_) was introduced in the 1650s because that registration clearly demarcated the 'unknown stranger'. Again, the guarding may have started more or less simultaneously with the formation of _hinin_ settlements in the 1620s.

### Organization

Given that the guarding was one source of income, if only indirectly (as discussed below), it was of course important for any _kaito_ to take charge of that function. One might expect internal conflicts among the Four Places to gain control of as many wards as possible, but so far there are no available documents to sustain such an assumption. This can perhaps be taken as a proof of how successful the co-operation proved to be among the Four Places.

Professor Uchida has analysed the distribution of wards according to _Yorozuyo Ôsaka machi kagami'_. Among other facts, he points out that although 22.9 per cent of the population of the Four Places lived in Tobita in 1789 and only 14.6 per cent

lived in Tenma, these two Places had almost the same number of wards to attend to ( Uchida 1987: 106, 109). Uchida traces the explanation for this seeming anomaly to the *nature* (and wealth) of the wards controlled. Tobita operated in more wealthy quarters of the city than Tenma, so the former could make a sufficient income from fewer wards. This mirrors the equality among the Four Places that was also seen in the distribution of new *hinin* after the roundup in 1684 (Tenna 4), mentioned above, and it must have been a byproduct of the co-operation in the Four Places' system of management.[12]

The proportionality between the wealth of a patron and the number of *kaito* guards is exemplified by HM no. 111 from 1777 (An'ei 6). It concerns the guarding of Nagahori Izumiya Kichi-zaemon's home, where six persons were on guard at that time. This Izumiya was a big merchant house, and the origin of to-day's Sumitomo.

One can demonstrate that Tenma *kaito* held a near-monopoly over Tenma *gumi*, and the engagement of Tennôji *kaito* was predominated in Ue-machi (see the map in Uchida 1987: 107). With these exceptions the distribution of wards among the Four Places was like a patchwork. Sixteen wards were sufficiently wealthy for two Places to operate in them, and in the two wards Kitahama 1 chôme and Kitahama 2 chôme, all Four Places were active (Uchida 1987: 105).

A licence to beg or work in a specific ward was delegated or distributed, perhaps sold, in the form of shares (*kabu*). A large number of the documents in *Hiden'in monjo* (HM) deals in one way or another with these shares, because they were an investment that could be sold, mortgaged or simply inherited and any of those actions resulted in one or more legal docu-ments. A typical share read, 'Night guarding at Shio-machi 2 chôme' (HM nos. 114, 115, HM: 142). The coverage of the shares varied and could include both day and night guarding, or be exclusively for the guarding of one house as the following shows, 'the guarding of Nagahori Izumiya Kichizaemon's house' (HM no. 111, HM: 140).

The value of the shares depended on (1) the wealth of the patron ward or house, (2) on the agreements concluded be-

tween the patron and the *kaito*. From the beginning there was probably not a fixed fee for the guarding services, but the shareholder had the right to beg on certain occasions, and in all likelihood received donations at other times as well. By the end of the early modern period things were well regulated, as is demonstrated in the following example from Doshô-machi 3 chôme:[13]

> '*Item* Copper 110,210 *mon*[14]
> The amount above is paid as salary (*chinsen*), for the *wakakimono* sent to our ward.
> In addition, Copper 98,000 *mon* is paid to the *wakakimono*.
> This is paid for services in the ward aside from the night guarding mentioned in the preceding paragraph [...] ' (Uchida 1987: 92).

As Uchida notes, this kind of agreement may not have been universal in Osaka, but it nevertheless gives an idea of the worth of the guarding service, and the potential income the share provided for its holder (Uchida 1987: 92). The example also illustrates the division of work within the *kaito* since the first amount mentioned was a salary paid to the *kaito* – probably the shareholder – while the second amount was paid directly to the guard.

Besides such regular fees, the shareholder was allowed to collect money on certain occasions, some being of a regular nature, while others only happened once in while.

### The regular occasions

The five season days – 1/7, 3/3, 5/5, 7/7 and 9/9 – were days of celebration, as some of them are today, and therefore regular occasions during the year when *hinin* were anticipated at the homes and given a little money or some food. This was also the case with seasonal events called *Sekizoro, Daikokumai* and *Torioi*, all of which originated in a kind of artistic performance in front of city residents' houses by *hinin* who would then receive a donation. Kitagawa Morisada (1810-?) notes that in his days *Sekizoro* and *Torioi* were only practised in Edo, and *Daikokumai* only in Osaka (Kitagawa 1996: 346-347).[15]

The Four Places at some time rationalized this kind of begging. From its office at Takahara it issued paper tags, a process that testifies to the corporation and reciprocal dependency among the four *kaito*. The tags were shared among the rank-and-file members who took them to the houses of 'their' ward, where they would ask for donations. This took place between the tenth and the last month of the year (Uchida 1991: 861). If a house contributed more than 500 *mon* it would get a tag stating the amount of the donation.

With a tag like that posted on a visible place by the door, other *hinin* were supposed to know that no further attempts on begging would be tolerated at that house. Houses that gave less did not get a tag, and could therefore be visited by other *hinin*, who would get one *mon* or so each (Kitagawa 1996: 347-348). *Hinin* who did not respect this rule were punished. In *Hiden'in monjo*, we find the case of Seihachi who got drunk on the third day in the new year's month, and although he knew he should not do so, he nevertheless asked for a donation at a house which had already paid its *Daikokumai* money. For this offence, he declared himself ready to accept any punishment (HM no. 69, HM: 101-102).[16]

The economic value was not as high as that of the *kaitoban* work. However, with 10 to 15 house owners in each ward, and with 585 wards to attend to, if each of these main houses gave 500 *mon*, this activity would gross at least 2,925,000 *mon*.[17]

### Occasional income

The list of events that triggered the right to a contribution or gift could be fairly long, like the one reproduced by Professor Okamoto in his book *Ran, ikki, hinin* [Chaos, Rebellion, *Hinnin*], which includes some 20 situations. The list was handed down to the rank-and-file members to be obeyed as it was an agreement between the leaders of the Four Places and the Theft Inspector of Osaka made in 1792 (Kansei 4) (Okamoto 1983: 50-53). It included all major events in a person's life – from conception, marked by the pregnant woman's use of an Iwata sash, to the annual memorial services for deceased household members – as well as the celebration of the opening of a new

shop, a sumô tournament, etc. How much money a *kaito* guard would procure on such occasions in the 1790s is not revealed, but according to an agreement reached in 1865, the donation was given in proportion to the amount of money otherwise spent on an event, such as a funeral or moving house, and was otherwise fixed at about 500 *mon* per event.

We must add that in contemporary Osaka it was common practice in the wards for the regulations to stipulate the amount a celebrant had to pay to all officials and those officially employed in his ward. The general rule was that the higher rank, the greater the fee. In comparison with the ward elder, the *kaito* guard was paid a mere fraction as an agreement from Kyôbashi 3 chôme of 1800 (Kansei 12) shows. It stipulates that when a property in a ward was handed over to a new owner and the name in the register was changed, the ward's leader should be presented with Copper 5000 *mon*, while the hairdresser (*kamiyui*) should have about Copper 500 *mon* (*Ôsaka no machi shikimoku* 1991: 56-57). If the standard of similar agreements can be applied to this case too, the *kaito* guard would get half of that of the hairdresser, that is approximately Copper 200 *mon*. 200 *mon* in 1800 corresponds closely with the typical 500 *mon* in the document of 1865, when taking the general inflation in prices into account.

Studies on the income derived from these occasional events have not progressed very far. Professor Uchida has examined a case from the early Meiji years and found that in Dôshu-machi in 1872 occasional donations only yielded 6,400 *mon*, less than 6 per cent of the fixed *kaito* guarding payment of 100,210 *mon* (Uchida 1987: 91). This does not, however, tell us much about the relative importance of the occasional donations earlier in the early modern period history. Rather we are inclined to believe they must have been of a more significant value at some point when care was taken to prepare the detailed regulations mentioned above. On top of the economic importance, the occasional gifts must have been of symbolic importance, as among the *hinin*'s income they were most clearly donations and as such helped to keep the image of *hinin*-as-beggar alive.

The economic aspect dealt with here was one incentive for control among the participating bodies. For the *kaito* leadership the questions were: Did the guard perform well? Was each *kaito* getting its fair share of the payment? Were their subordinates under control?

A dispute among members of the Hiden'in *kaito* concerning guarding shares ended up as a disciplinary case, where the *kaito* leader appealed to the city magistrates to have the case dismissed because it would otherwise threaten the stability of the *kaito*. This was because the complainer had attempted to take a shortcut, ignoring the ruling of his immediate superiors (HM no. 141, 162-189, especially 185). Ultimately, then, control over the guarding system and those who worked as guards was one way for the leaders to legitimate their *raison d'être* to the city magistrates, and preserve their power within their association.

### Guarding and control

Protection is the very nature of guarding, so it would be tautological to say that the *kaito* guard system was an instrument of control. However, looking at the regulations issued in relation to this service, it becomes evident that the control function was supposed to work at several levels.

The regulations dealt with the performance of the guard, i.e. how they were allowed to beg, their behaviour and their efficiency. These regulations were usually issued by the leadership of the *kaito* but often reflected instructions handed down by the city magistrates, or some kind of agreement reached between the leadership on behalf of the association and a user of its service.

In the following we shall juxtapose a contemporary description of the guarding with decrees and regulations issued by the three levels of authority over the *kaito* guard. This will elucidate the authorities' concern for the nature of the work and the propriety of the worker.

The description of what the *kaito* guards were doing was written in the 1850s by Kitagawa Morisada (1810-?), who was born in Osaka and moved to Edo in 1840. He recorded his ob-

servations on everyday life in Osaka and Edo. Kitagawa's picture of Osaka's guarding *hinin* gives us an idea of the working conditions of the guards – patrolling the ward every half hour, i.e. twelve times, during the night and having a small hut at their disposal. It also conveys a sense of the hierarchy within the *kaito* as well as among beggars, registered and unregistered alike. This is highlighted most clearly in the phrase 'They are subordinates of the *chôri's* men. The *hinin* call them 'Boss' (*oyakata*)' (Kitagawa 1996: 343). The 'subordinates' are the 'apprentices' mentioned before. Because the *hinin* address the 'apprentices' as 'Boss', they must have been unregistered beggars, since all registered *hinin* belonged to the *kaito*. Now, in their comments on *Dôtonbori hinin kankei monjo* Professors Okamoto and Uchida have noted that the 'apprentices' were probably not registered *hinin*, but those who aspired to become registered, and members of the *kaito*, an observation based on a document from 1805 (Bunka 2) when the leader of the Dôtonbori *kaito* asks for permission to include an apprentice who has been working for him for four or five years (Okamoto and Uchida 1976: 510 cf. DH I: 318).[18]

From Kitagawa's description a couple of the purposes of the *kaito* guard also become clear: to be alert for fires and make sure that children were not being abandoned in the ward or at a specific house.

We find a similar concern in other texts, for example in 'Notebook on Formalities within the Ward' (*Chônai teishiki chô*) for Shiraga-machi from 1822 (Bunsei 5), where the first paragraph instructs that *'hinin* beggars (*hinin no kojiki*) do not stand nor prostrate themselves under the eaves of the residents' houses, on the shore, or under or on the bridges.' In a similar way, suspicious-looking strangers were not allowed to stay. The reason for this seeming hostility had at least one root in the rule that held the ward or individual house responsible for the convalescence of the stranger that happened to fall ill in that vicinity, and, as for abandoned children, entrusted their upbringing to that ward or house. Aside from the fear of a social and economic burden, the strangers and *'hinin* beggars' were probably feared as a potential criminals or arsonists.[19]

The term 'hinin beggars' (*hinin no kojiki*) is of interest here, as it must refer to the unregistered *hinin*, just like *hinin* in Kitagawa's text above. That the *kaito* guard, too, was fundamentally a beggar, or at least regarded as such, is evident in the first two paragraphs with phrases like 'alms rice' and 'you may not beg with force'. In fact the social status of the employed persons is emphasized in a paragraph by which he must agree to refrain from wearing footgear. Seen with contemporary eyes, the question of footgear was related the question of propriety, because everyone was supposed to enact his or her social status down to the most minute detail.[20]

This is also evident in several documents from *Hiden'in monjo* issued by the *kaito* leaders, which instruct the 'rank-and-file members' on how to behave while on duty. An example is HM no. 64 written in 1814, where the now familiar, concern for diligence is emphasized in paragraphs 1, 2, 5 and 7, and the concern for propriety is revealed in paragraphs 4, 6 and 8. Paragraph 7 states:

> '*Item* [7]: When employing an apprentice, you should examine the candidates to your utmost to avoid employing those who are tattooed or have been expelled etc., and report speedily to us, if [you find] any. Each of the hired apprentices should be firmly instructed that they should take care of the ward district; that guard huts are not for people to gather in; that especially unreliable persons should not under any circumstances enter without permission; and of course it is very important that improper conduct within the employing ward must be avoided. This has repeatedly been stated, but we have been warned about it, so we state it again, and it should be told to all apprentices. If an apprentice does not comply with this in the future, even the shareholder will be punished promptly' [HM no. 64: 95-98].

The city magistrates issued orders to the *kaito* leader, who in turn, to prove that he was in control of his group, instructed his subordinates, who in their turn were made responsible for the acts of their subordinates, the apprentices, as well as for their history (in the sense that the 'rank-and-file members' should check the apprentices' background). In that way the 'rank-and-file members' were also given an obligation to control their

subordinates, for their own sake in order to avoid troubles, but also on behalf of the city magistrates.

In 1792 (Kansei 4/ 11/3) the city magistrates' office gave 'inspiration from above':

> 'But when *hinin* gather in a large crowd, it can be beyond the power of a single *hininban* in a ward [to handle], and then the residents of the ward should join him and disperse the crowd the moment they see it' [Kôtatsu no. 1029, OSS IV: 143].

Concern with the behaviour of subordinates seems to have been widespread and could also be found among the *hinin* leaders (see HM nos 117-135; HM: 143-153). The charge to the residents to assist inspectors is not seen very often, but the encouragement is logical, considering that local security matters were the concern of the *jishinban*. It is interesting to note that again the word *hinin* must refer to the unregistered *hinin*, while *hininban* is identical to *kaitoban*. This differentiation could indicate that the city's authorities were inclined to accept the *kaito*'s self-perception of not being beggars (*hinin*) in the common sense of the early modern society. A good example of that self-perception is the leadership's appeal of 1741 (Genbun 6) included in *Dôtonbori hinin kankei monjo* where they ask to have the epithet '*hinin*' removed from the records on *kaito* members in the Register According to Faith, and to be recorded as '*kaito* associates' (*kaito nakama*) rather than as 'beggar associates' (*kojiki nakama*) because they are different from those *hinin* who sleep under bridges and warehouses (DH I: 215-217).

### *Police assistants*

The *kaito*'s link to the city magistrates' bureaucracy took the form of the Theft Inspectors (see HM no. 3, HM: 27).

The work as assistants (*tesaki*) of the constables and patrolmen under the city magistrates was part of the *kaito* members' public obligations (*kôyaku*), and as such went unpaid. Still, the work could improve the occupant's image and self-esteem. We have observed how the organization of the Four Places gave their leaders authority internally, and how the city magistrates' use of this organization endowed it with authority externally

over unregistered *hinin*, particularly when it was put in charge of the immediate management of 'new *hinin*' in 1691. This kind of responsibility must have increased the social value of the *kaito* members.

In their daily work the *hinin* assisted the constables and patrolmen in two ways – either as regular assistants on patrols through the town, or as spies (see HM nos. 105-107, HM: 132-135). The regular patrols (*sadame machi mawari*) took place twice a day – at three in the afternoon, lasting six hours, and at two in the morning, lasting four hours, and covered the city itself and neighbouring villages (Fujiki 1959: 901).

Whether working as assistants or spies, the *hinin* were to be alert, discreet and courteous. In other words, they were supposed to observe propriety and act in accordance with their status and job–standard requirements in the early modern Japanese society. *Hiden'in monjo* has documents with regulations on the duties of a *tesaki*, the oldest of them dating from 1762 (Hôreki 12/7/7) (HM 94, HM: 117-118), followed by six from the Kansei years, 1789-1801 (HM: 96-98, 100-102, HM: 119-124, 126-130). They are essentially alike, so HM 101 from 1800 (Kansei 12/1) will serve as an example.

The main point in the document is discipline. When propriety – in conduct and appearance – is respected, discipline will be re-established. In close connection to this follows the concern about bribes. Paragraph 2 reads:

> '*Item* [2]: When you are on an official errand (*goyô*) you should be modest and not solicit bribes for private gain; no matter how kindly you are treated you must not be partial' (HM 102, HM: 128).

Corruption/bribery existed and was sometimes directly looked for, as is demonstrated below.

Paragraphs 4 and 5 instruct the *kogashira* to keep account of their expenses and submit a report when they returned from a job outside Osaka. To be able to comply with this, some essential education must have been a precondition for the *kogashira*, at least so they were able to check what others wrote down on their behalf.

We understand that only full members of the *kaito* participated in this kind of patrolling, a fact that is confirmed by some of the orders issued by the city magistrates (see Furegaki 4301, OSS IV: 614). So when compared with the service as *kaito* guards, to be an assistant to the police had a higher status within the *kaito* and this, in turn, would confirm the importance to members of the Four Places of this service when seen from the perspective of identity and dignity.

The assistants most likely spent most of their time within the boundaries of the city, but sometimes the work took them far away, to Edo for instance, as when Zensuke, leader of Hiden'in, and Kichiemon, leader of Tobita, together with Seiemon and Gen'emon, two assistant headmen from the *kaito* in Tenma, were summoned to the Western city magistrate's office and ordered on an escort to Edo in 1762 (Hôreki 12/5/27) (HM no. 6, HM: 34). A patrolman from Tenma, writing in 1811 (Bunka 8), observed that the leaders and assistant headmen used to operate within the city, but when Seda Fujishirô (no bio-data available) became one of the four Theft Inspectors, they were dispatched to any place in Japan west of Osaka, including Chûkoku, Shikoku and Kyûshû (in the text called Saikoku) (*Teoboe* 1969: 371).

In 1834 a group of *tesaki* allegedly misused their position, and the complaint filed against them will serve as an example of the Four Places' *modus operandi* outside of Osaka. The complaint was filed with the city magistrates by villagers from the Harima Province (today the north-western part of Hyôgo Prefecture), who claimed to have been victims of the *hinin* misconduct.

> 'In rural districts of both Settsu and Kawachi, when there are thieves and rascals, the city magistrates of Osaka dispatch a search team to the village before sending officials. The members of the search group are guarding *hinin* (*banhinin*) from the Four Places, called assistant headmen (*kogashira*). Without as much as greeting the village officials, they arrest peasants and gather arrested persons from everywhere in that village. Sometimes they even bring them to other village officials. Anyway, those arrested from all quarters are placed at a low place and "interrogated", and beaten gradually by the aforementioned guarding *hinin*. Many of them get sick for life,

others are affected for half a year or a full year and die. Occasionally there are persons who have the strength to endure this.

The guarding *hinin*, however, stay at a gathering place (*yoseba*). They eat and drink to excess, and anything else such as straw sandals and tobacco are given to many people, so expenditures are extreme. They are paid by selling or mortgaging a low-grade field, if one owns any, or selling the house, so many have had to terminate their family name due to these expenses. If, during the beating mentioned before, the slightest connection can be established from the utterance of the offender, that person is summoned to the gathering place by an order in the official style issued by the guarding *hinin* at the gathering place together with the assistance of the elders and village head. The order states that they are officials for criminal issues and that the person should humbly come to the mentioned place together with the village officials.

Although they [the guarding *hinin*] are not officials, the guarding *hinin* designated above are seated above, and the offender as well as the village officials are seated on old matting. They speak with power and interrogate, although one often knows this is done in an improper way. On these occasions they dispute over this and that, and one becomes weary of the time it takes, even in cases that could be easily concluded. Unfortunately it does not really stop there, and they become more and more arrogant. The peasants and guarding *hinin* lose their composure. Besides, on recent occasions, the villagers forget their upbringing. They greet the guarding *hinin* and are servile to them.

Should one happen to offend a guarding beggar, one will be subject to their wrath. They will pretend to have the authority to interrogate, so even innocent people are brutally arrested and interrogated harsher than the offender. When these things go on for two or three months without protection [of the peasants] it creates fear even among the village officials. There have been cases where officials were addressed with disrespectful words by the guarding *hinin* when they arrested someone. Furthermore there have been cases where guarding *hinin* from the Four Places have neglected the costs for wood and meals in connection with their stay. They have assumed the air of being officials and done all these things. This will be clear if you investigate them.

There have been orders issued in the past from time to time. We appreciated it highly when, on the occasion last year

of the Snake during the tenth month where Môsuke and two other guarding *hinin* of a village in Mino province were punished along with the village officials, an order was issued for Settsu and Kawachi countries, letting all of us comply with the will of the higher authorites.

We have tried to review our procedures according to the clauses of that order, but it is hard to change and correct things acquired through many years of bad habits, with the present social status of the village officials. When they [the guarding *hinin*] are assigned police authority, this and that is mixed up and, as can be expected, we become afraid of hindrances to the performance of our duty.

Instructions ought to be sent immediately from the city magistrates in Osaka to the village officials in both Settsu and Kawachi provinces as well as to the guarding *hinin* of the Four Places, repeating the gist of the orders and clearly outlining that it is the village officials who are in charge when interrogating and arrests are needed, and who give the guarding *hinin* instructions before the officials depart for the 'field'. As a result of this, the guarding *hinin* will not beat suspects on their own [judgement], and when freed from the hardship of interrogation the numbers of peasants who worked the soil all their life but have to give up their family name will be small. As a natural outcome, there will be no uncultivated fields.

In relation to this petition of ours to the office overseeing imperial and private estates in Settsu and Kawachi provinces, we sincerely beg your forgiveness, and thank you for kindly listening to our message above. On behalf of all village peasants we humbly thank you for your favourable protection.'

Tenpô 5 (1834) (Excerpt from *Yamasaki han Daishoya shoke mono*, quoted in Matsuoka and Yokota 1976: 159-160)

The conduct of the *hinin* was, if accurately recorded, at variance with the pledge they most likely had given in accordance with the document of 1800 (HM no. 101) or a similar one. The use of torture in investigations was common and accepted, but in a society where many things were dependent on status, including the conditions of imprisonment and means of execution, the fact that *hinin* took it upon themselves to investigate the acts of farmers rather than just prepare such an investigation must have been seen as an added humiliation. When reading the accusations against the guarding *hinin*, the anger resulting from this humiliation is felt, and could be the reason for what must

be an exaggeration of the effects of the guarding *hinin's* stay – loss of self-respect, loss of lives, and ultimately loss of income for the lordship.

However, the frequency of orders relating to discipline from the city magistrates to the Four Places and their immediate superiors, suggest that negligence of propriety and acceptance of bribes were not just suspicions or fears of the administration.[21] This relationship of antagonism fed on anger and fear must have stimulated whatever general negative sentiments towards *hinin* that the farmers and citizens already held.

The text exemplifies one type of relationship between 'good people' (*ryômin*), i.e. the villagers, and 'base people' (*senmin*), i.e. the guarding *hinin*, at the end of the early modern period when antagonism and discrimination among the status groups were on the increase (cf. Minegishi 1996). It also illustrates well the pattern of control where one controlled group, the *hinin*, are used by the authorities to control yet another group of controlled people, namely the villagers.[22]

## Conclusion

The focus of this article has been on the organization of registered *hinin* in Osaka during the early modern period and on their work (or services) as guards in individual wards of the city and assistants to the constabulary. It has been demonstrated how the hierarchical structuration, prevalent in the society as such, influenced the *hinin* community as well. Although the work as guards or as police assistants originally consisted of services carried out in exchange for donations from a patron – be it an individual house, a ward or the city magistrate – in the course of the early modern period payments were gradually fixed. While the 'salaries' and donations were meagre, they nevertheless were steady and presumably sufficient to lead a tolerable life – advantages not usually associated with situation of *hinin*. This may have been one incentive for unregistered *hinin* to seek inclusion in the registered *hinin* association, a process that could last several years while the applicant served

as apprentice. In this way, the Association of the *kaito*, seems to have been a means for providing security for the individual *hinin*.

It is understood that as an Association (*nakama*) the Four Places was authorized by the city magistrates to perform the following tasks:

1   to manage the registered *hinin*;
2   to organize the guarding services in the wards of Osaka and in villages under the jurisdiction of Osaka's city magistrates by issuing licences;
3   to organize collections of donations, some of which were seasonal gifts paid in exchange for a printed receipt, while others were occasional by nature;
4   to organize the service as police assistants. This responsibility increased the Association's control of potential begged income, but it also increased the city magistrates' control over the registered *hinin* and through their services the control over unregistered *hinin* as well.

The Association probably also increased the security in the wards and villages as far as the detection of crimes, fires and unwanted persons was concerned, but at times the presence of the *hinin* could arouse anger among the 'good people', as the aforementioned complaint from a group of villagers demonstrated.

Within the social hierarchy of the early modern period, the *hinin* belonged at the very bottom. Together with the group labelled *eta* or 'much polluted', they included the majority of the marginalized people at that time. The organized, registered *hinin* in Osaka at least once tried to get rid of the stigma of being *hinin*, by asking to be called something else. They did not succeed, yet in a society where much was in a name, the fact that the city magistrates as well as an employing ward and a contemporary observer made a distinction in reference between *kaito* guards and *hinin*, and that *hinin* in these cases must have referred to unregistered *hinin*, is of importance. Indeed, the observer, Kitagawa Morisada, went as far as to state that 'The "*nayashita*" [Under the Barns] are *hinin* who live under the floor

of the earth storehouses that are located on all the riverbanks. Are they the peers of the *kaito*? I think they are rather ranked below them' (Kitagawa 1996: 344).

It would be going beyond the facts to say that the *kaito* members attempted to change the social status system. But it seems clear that they tried to change their position within it.

What became of the *hinin* when the social status system was abolished in 1871? This question cannot be answered yet. The Four Places ceased to exist in a judicial sense, but at least the southern part of Osaka where Hiden'in, Tobita and Dôtonbori once were situated, still has a high concentration of socially underprivileged people. In the winter of 2000 the majority of Osaka's 8,000 homeless lived in the streets of that vicinity.

---

*Christian M. Hermansen is currently working on his Ph.D. dissertation, an examination of* Hiden'in Monjo *and* hinin *as a social order. He has a deep interest in the treatment of the socially marginalized in Japanese history, and wants to pursue this line of study, focusing on the attitude and role of Japan's traditional religions from that perspective. From February 2001 he takes up his appointment as Associate Director at the NCC Center for the Study of Japanese Religions in Kyoto. Adress: Karasuma shimodachiuri agaru, Kamikyo-ku, Kyoto 602–8011 Japan.*
*Phone/fax. +81–75–432–1945.*

# Notes

[1] 'Under the Barns' is the translation for the term *'nayashita'* which referred to those *hinin* who lived under the floor of the earth structures along riverbanks (see Kitagawa 1996: 344).

[2] This term is extremely derogative and should be avoided. Here I shall refer to the status group as 'much polluted' with no illusion that quotation marks will soften the impact of the term. Otherwise the more neutral word *'kawata'* is preferred.

[3] List of abbreviations used in this paper:
DH – *Dôtonbori hinin kankei monjo*
HM – *Hiden'in monjo*
KDJ – *Kokushi daijiten*
OSS – *Ôsaka shishi*

For full publication details of these, refer to the References section.

4   There were several other categories. In 1850 (?) Motoori Uchizen, the heir of the School of National Learning (Kokugaku) compiled a list of 52 groups of discriminated statuses (Motoori 1971: 489-522).

5   When the Tokugawa government had Osaka castle rebuilt between 1619 and 1634, there were at times several hundred thousand people working on that project, so in 1634 the merchant and artisan population numbered 404,929 (McClain 1999: 48-50, 75).

6   More details on the composition of the ward and its inhabitants could be added, but space does not permit their inclusion.

7   In *Osaka: The Merchants' Capital of Early Modern Japan*, 'nakama' is defined as 'an officially authorised association whose members determined qualifications for membership and set regulations concerning many aspects of their own activities' (McClain and Wakita 1999a: 277). According to the 'Kokushi daijiten', this definition applies to the early modern phenomenon of *kabu nakama* (shared *nakama* or licensed *nakama*) (Harafuji 1989). As is discussed later, the Four Places had a system of shares or licences (*kabu*) so even in this stricter sense of *nakama* they qualify as one.

8   This situation resembles that of the 'much polluted' in the Osaka area, who used to live in villages north of the city but were resettled in one 'Watanabe village' south west of the city in the 1620s (McClain 1999: 71-72).

9   At Dôtonbori this position was always filled, but the documentation on Hiden'in indicates that it was not the case in that settlement.

10  In the case of Dotonbori, Okamoto and Uchida (1976) give these figures for the categories: *kumigashira* (3-6), *kogashira* (many), *wakakimono* (52) and *deshi* (150-200). The figures for Hiden'in are not known.

11  On the jail at Takahara, see Fujii 1990: 103-116.

12  The issue of solidarity among the *kaito* recurs throughout Uchida's study. The absence of internal power struggles, or at least the lack of evidence thereof, is a major argument for Uchida's point.

13  Doshô-machi 1, 2, 3 chôme formed the centre for Osaka's association of traditional Japanese pharmaceutical chemists (*wayakushu nakama*). According to OSS, there were 121 chemists (OSS I: 734-735). The transliteration follows 'Nihon chimei daijiten' vol. 3 (Nihon chimei daijiten 1967) In James McClain and Wakita Osamu, the ward's name is transliterated as Doshû machi (McClain and Wakita 1999b: 85), while the register for Ôsaka shishi has it under 'dausho machi' (OSS Register: 301).

14  A *mon* was a copper coin, the smallest denomination in the contemporary money system. In early Meiji 6,500 *mon* were the equivalent of one gold *ryô*. The value of the 98,000 *mon* mentioned in the document was equivalent of circa 1 *koku* of polished rice, which would not see a family through the expenses of a year.

15  Takayanagi (1993: 74-80) has more details on the performance of *Torioi*, including one of the songs used for this performance.
16  Dated Kansei 3/New year's month (1791).
17  Or between 450 and 730 *ryô* per year, depending on the exchange rate. When one *koku* was equal one *ryô* of gold, as it was in principle, each *kaito* would get not less than 100 *koku* per year. The nature of the wards would to some extent balance the different number of wards under the control of the individual *kaito*, making their share of the total closer to 25 per cent.
18  Professor Tsukada has a different interpretation, in that he finds the apprentices to be the Osaka equivalent of Edo's 'employed *hinin*' (*kakae hinin*) in which case they would be regular members (Tsukada 1997: 311).
19  Ogyû Sorai (1666-1728), philosopher and political adviser, in his political manifest *Seidan* claimed that, 'many among the beggars (*kojiki*) have ignited fires, and the victims have suffered much. Nobody has paid any attention to the fact that beggars (*hinin*) for several decades have taken such vicious actions' (cf. Takayanagi 1981: 60).]
20  On regulations on clothes, see also HM no. 12, 53, and no. 64, pp. 40-43, 72-73, 95-98. On similar regulations for ordinary townspeople, see OSS III: 259, 301, 398, 556, 840.
21  It could, of course, also be a 'front' of the City Magistrate, who might actually have appreciated the rough work done by the *kaito* members, but this assumption cannot be substantiated.
22  It is the general argument of Matsuoka and Yokoda that during the early modern period the local villages' beggar guard, usually just one family of registered *hinin*, switched their loyalty from the villagers to the city magistrates (Matsuoka and Yokoda 1976).

# References

Davis, Winston (1992) *Japanese Religion and Society, Paradigms of Structure and Change*. New York: State University of New York Press.
*Dôtonbori hinin kankei monjo* (1974, 1976) [Writings Related to *Hinin* at the Dôton Canal] vols I and II. Transferred into print by Okamoto Ryôichi and Uchida Kusuo. Osaka: Seibundô.
Fujii Yoshio (1990) *Ôsaka machibugyô to keibatsu* [Osaka's City Magistrate and Punishment]. Osaka: Seibundô.
Fujiki Kiichirô 1959. 'Ôsaka machibugyô kanka ni okeru shihô kaisatsu soshiki ni tsuite [On the Structure of the Judicial Police under the Jursidiction of Osaka's City Magistrate] in Kwansei Gakuin Daigaku Bungakubu (ed.) *Sôritsu 70 shûnen Kwansei Gakuin Daigaku Bungakubu*

*kinen ronbunshû.* Nishinomiya-shi: Kwansei Gakuin Daigaku Bungakubu: 887-905.

Fukutani Katsumi (1995) 'Kôgi to mibunsei (III) Hyakushô to moro mibun' [Shogunate Government and the System of Social Stratification (chapter 3) Peasants and all Status Groups] in Hara Hidesaburô *et al.* (eds) *Taikei Nihon kokkashi* [Outline of Japan's National History] *vol. 3 Kinsei.* Tokyo: Tôkyô daigaku shuppankai.

Harafuji Hiroshi (1989) 'Nakamakoto' in *Kokushi daijiten* [Encyclopedia of National History], 15 vols. Compiled and edited by Kokushi daijiten henshû iinkai. Tokyo: Yoshikawa kôbunkan. Vol. 10, p. 648.

*Hiden'in monjo* (1989) [Documents from Hiden'in] Transferred into print by Okamoto Ryôichi and Uchida Kusuo. Osaka: Seibundô.

Ikeda Yoshimasa (1986) *Nihon shakai fukushi-shi* [A History of Japan's Social Welfare]. Kyoto: Hôritsu bunka sha.

Inoue Kaoru (1985) 'Shitennôji engishiki' in *Kokushi daijiten*, vol. 6, p. 906. Kokushi daijiten henshû iinkai, comp. and ed. Tokyo: Yoshikawa kôbunkan.

Jinno Kiyokazu (1993) *Nihon kodai nuhi no kenkyû* [Studies on *Nuhi* (Slaves or Servants) in Ancient Japan]. Nagoya: Nagoya Daigaku Shuppankai.

Jütte, Robert (1994) *Poverty and Deviance in Early Modern Europe.* New Approaches to European History no. 4. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kitagawa Morisada (1996). *Kinsei fûzokushi* or *Morisada mankô* [Records on Customs in Early Modern Japan, or Morisada's Sketches], revised and annotated by Usami Hideki, vol. 1. Tokyo: Iwanami shoten.

*Kokushi daijiten* (1979-1997) [Encyclopaedia of National History], 15 vols. Compiled and edited by Kokushi daijiten henshû iinkai. Tokyo: Yoshikawa kôbunkan.

Leupp, Gary P. (1992) *Servants, Shophands, and Laborers in the Cities of Tokugawa Japan.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

*Machibugyô kyûki* (1994) [Old Diary of the City Magistrate] Ôsaka-shi shihensanjo (eds), Ôsaka-shi shi shiryô [Historical Sources for the City History of Osaka] nos 41 and 42. Osaka: Ôsaka-shi shiryô chôsakai.

Matsumoto Shirô (1980) 'Kinsei toshi ron' [Discussion on the Early Modern Towns] in *Bakuhansei shakai no kôzô* [The Structure of the Bakuhan Governed Society]. Tokyo: Yûikaku.

Matsuoka Hideo and Yokoda Hizakazu (1976) 'Hininban' kenkyû nôto [Study Notes on *Hininban*] in *Kinsei burakushi no kenkyû* [Studies in the Early Modern History of the Buraku] vol. 1. Edited by Nishihari chiiki kawatamura monjo kenkyûkai. Tokyo: Yûsankaku.

McClain, James L. (1982) *Kanazawa: A Seventeenth-Century Japanese Castle Town.* New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

McClain, James L. (1999) 'Space, Power, Wealth, and Status in Seventeenth-Century Osaka' in J. McClain and Wakita Osamu (eds) *Osaka: The*

*Merchants' Capital of Early Modern Japan*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, pp. 44-79.

McClain, James L. and Wakita Osamu (eds) (1999a) *Osaka: The Merchants' Capital of Early Modern Japan*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

McClain, James L. and Wakita Osamu (1999b). 'Osaka across the Ages' in J. McClain and Wakita Osamu (eds) *Osaka: The Merchants' Capital of Early Modern Japan*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Minegishi Kentarô (1996) *Kinsei hisabetsuminshi no kenkyû* [A Study of the History of the Discriminated People in Tokugawa Japan]. Tokyo: Kôsôshobo.

Miyamoto Mataji 1985. *Kinsei Ôsaka no keizai to chôsei* (The Economy of Osaka and Rule of the Wards in Early Modern Japan). Osaka: Bunken Shuppan.

Monier-Williams, Sir Monier *et al.* (1964) [1899] *A Sanskrit–English Dictionary. Etymologically and Philologically Arranged, with Special Reference to Cognate Indo-European Languages*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Motoori Uchien (1971) 'Senminkô' [Thoughts on Despised People], in *Nihon shômin seikatsu shiryô shûsei dai jûyon kan Buraku* [Collection of Sources on the Daily Life of Japan's Commoners. Vol. 14: Buraku]. Tokyo: San'ichi shobô, pp. 489-522.

Nakamura Hajime (1975) *Bukkyôgo daijiten* [Dictionary of Buddhist Terms], 2 vols. Tokyo: Tokyo shohako.

Nakao Kenji (1992) *Edoshakai to danzaemon* [Edo society and Danzaemon]. Osaka: Kaihô shuppansha.

*Naniwa 'saka Kikuyachô* (1977) (Kiroku Toshi seikatsu shi 10) [Records of the History of Daily Life in the Town]. Kyoto: Yanagiwara shoten.

*Nihon chimei daijiten* (1967) [Encyclopaedia of Japanese Place Names]ed.. Watanabe *et al.* 6 vols. Tokyo: Asakura shoten.

*Nihon kokugo daijiten* (1975) [Dictionary of the Japanese Language]. Compiled and edited by Nihon daijiten hankokai. Tokyo: Shôgakkan.

Okamoto Ryôichi (1983) *Ran, ikki, hinin* [Chaos, Rebellion, *Hinin*]. Tokyo: Kashiwa shobo.

Okamoto Ryôichi and Uchida Kusuo (1976) 'Editorial notes' in *Dôtonbori hinin kankei monjo* [Writings Concerning *Hinin* at the Dôton Canal], vol. II. Osaka: Seibundô.

Okamoto Ryôichi and Uchida Kusuo (1989) 'Editorial notes' in *Hiden'in monjo* [Documents from Hiden'in].Osaka: Seibundô.

Ooms, Herman (1989) *Tokugawa Ideology: Early Constructs, 1570-1680*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Ooms, Herman (1996) *Tokugawa Village Practice: Class, Status, Power, Law*. Berkley, Los Angeles, London: University of California Press.

*Ôsaka gojôdai kin'yaku nakanaori kakitome* [Registered Writings on Reconciliation in the Office of Osaka Castle's Intendant].

*Ôsaka machibugyô kannai yôran* (1985) [Survey on the Jurisdiction of Osaka's City Magistrate), Ôsaka-shi shihensanjo (eds), *Ôsaka-shi shi shiryô* [Historical Sources for the City History of Osaka], no. 15. Osaka: Ôsaka-shi shiryô chôsakai.

*Ôsaka no machi shikimoku* (1991) [Ward Agreements from Osaka] Ôsaka-shi shihensanjo (eds), *Ôsaka-shi shi shiryô* [Historical Sources for the City History of Osaka] no. 32. Osaka: Ôsaka-shi shiryô chôsakai.

*Ôsaka-shi shi* (1988) [Osaka City History] 8 vols, 1911-1914 ( Osaka: Seibundô.

Ryugawa Seijiro and Ishii Ryôsuke (eds) (1974) *Ninsokuyoseba shi* [History of the Ninsokuyoseba]. Tokyo: Sôbunsha .

Sasayama Harushi (1991) 'Hômen' in *Kokushi daijiten*, 15 vols. Compiled and edited by Kokushi daijiten henshû iinkai. Tokyo: Yoshikawa kôbunkan. Vol. 12, p. 652.

Smith, Robert J., (1974) *Ancestor Worship in Contemporary Japan*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Sumiya, Mikio and Taira, Koji (eds) (1979) *An Outline of Japanese Economic History, 1603-1940: Major Works and Research Findings*. Tokyo: University of Tokyo Press.

Takayanagi Kaneyoshi (1981) *Edo jidai hinin no seikatsu* [The Daily Life of Hinin in the Edo Era]. Seikatsu shi sôsho [Series on the History of Daily Life], no. 21. Tokyo: Yuisakaku.

*Teoboe* (1969) [Learning by Doing]. Transferred from manuscript and introduced by Morita Yoshinori in *Banhinin monjo* [Documents from Guarding *Hinin*] *Buraku kaihô* no. 5 (October 1969), pp. 369-374.

Tsuakda Takeshi (1992) *Mibunsei shakai to shimin shakai - kinsei nihon no shakai to hô* [Social Status System Society and Townspeople Society – Society and Law in Early Modern Japan]. Tokyo: Kashiwa shobo.

Tsukada Takeshi (1997) *Kinsei mibunsei to shûen shakai* [Social Status and Marginality in Tokugawa Japan]. Tokyo: Tokyo daigaku shuppankai.

Tsukada Takeshi *et al.* (eds) (1994) *Mibunteki shûen* [Social Status Marginal]. Kyoto: Buraku mondai kenkyûsho shuppanbu.

Tsukada Takeshi *et al.* (1994) *Senmin mibun ron – chûsei kara kinsei e* [Discussion on the Status of 'Despised People' from the Middle Ages to the Tokugawa Era]. Tokyo: Meiseki shoten.

Tsukahira, Toshio G. (1966) *Feudal Control in Tokugawa Japan – The Sankin Kôtai System*. (Harvard East Asian Monographs). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Tsunoda Ryusaku, William Theodore de Bary and Donald Keene (eds) (1964) *Sources of Japanese Tradition*, 2 vols. New York: Columbia University Press.

Uchida Kusuo (1987) [1978] 'Kinsei hininron' [Discussion on Early Modern *Hinin*], in Buraku mondai kenkyûsho (ed.), *Burakushi no kenkyû, zenkindai hen* [Studies in the History of Buraku, premodern part]. Kyoto: Buraku mondai kenkyûsho shuppanbu, pp. 214-241.

Uchida Kusuo (1991) 'Shikasho no keisei to soshiki' [Form and Composition of the Four Places], Chapter 4 part 8 section 4 in vol. 3 *Shinshû Ôsaka-shi shi* [Newly Compiled Osaka City History], Shinshû Ôsaka-shi shi hensan iinkai (ed.). Osaka: Ôsaka-shi.

Uematsu Tadahiro (1998) *Shi nô kô shô jukyô shisô to kanryô shihai* [Shi nô kô shô – Confucian Philosophy and Bureaucratic Control]. Tokyo: Dôbunkan.

*Vocabvlario da lingoa de iapam* (1960) [1603]. Reprint of the original edition in possession of the Bodleian Library, Oxford, issued by Companhia de iesus. Tokyo: Iwanami shoten.

Wakita Ôsamu (1994) *Kinsei Ôsaka no keizai to bunka* [Economy and Culture of Early Modern Osaka]. Kyoto: Jinbun shoin.

Watanabe Hiro (1990) 'Hinin' in *Kokushi daijiten*, 15 vols. Compiled and edited by Kokushi daijiten henshû iinkai. Tokyo: Yoshikawa kôbunkan. Vol. 11, p. 960.

Weiner, Michael (ed.) (1997) *Japan's Minorities. The Illusion of Homogeneity*. London and New York: Routledge.

Woolf, Stuart (1992) 'Order, Class and the Urban Poor', in Michael L. Bush (ed.) *Social Orders and Social Classes in Europe since 1500— Studies in Social Stratification*. London and New York: Longman, pp. 185-198.

Yoshida Nobuyuki (1999) 'Osaka's Brotherhood of Mendicant Monks' in J. McClain and Wakita Osamu (eds) *Osaka, the Merchants' Capital of Early Modern Japan*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, pp. 158-179.

Yoshino, I. Roger (1977) *The Invisible Visible Minority: Japan's Burakumin*. Osaka: Buraku kaihô kenkyusho.