

## ***Yado and Kuchiire***

Takashi TSUKADA\*

**Keywords:** urban society, periphery of social stratification, *yado*, employment agents, *nakama* guild

### **Explanatory Note**

The paper ‘*Yado and Kuchiire*’ was originally included in the volume *Mibunteki shūen to kinsei shakai 3: Akinai ga musubu hitobito (Periphery of Social Stratification and Early Modern Society Vol. 3: Social connection through trading activity)* (Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 2007), edited by Naofumi Hara. In this paper, the term *yado* refers to both lodging establishments and *kuchiire*, or employment agents. A group of eight editors, including me, organized a series of joint studies. Dozens of scholars participated in these studies and the resulting papers and records of discussion were published in a nine-volume series entitled *Mibunteki shūen to kinsei shakai (Periphery of Social Stratification and Early Modern Society)*. As noted above, this paper comes from one of the volumes in that series. In 1990, Nobuyuki Yoshida, Osamu Wakita and I founded the ‘Periphery of Social Stratification’ Research Group. On the basis of studies conducted by members of that group, we published a book entitled *Mibunteki shūen (Peripheries of Social Stratification)*, a six-volume series entitled *Kinsei no mibunteki shūen (Early Modern Peripheries of Social Stratification)*, and the above-mentioned nine-volume *Mibunteki shūen to kinsei shakai* series.

Traditionally, early modern society was characterized as politically rigid, organized on the basis of a caste system of ‘warriors, farmers, craftsmen, traders and discriminated *eta* and *hinin*’. However, as research on *kōgi* (public administration) and the early modern caste system developed in the 1980s, early modern society came to be understood differently. Scholars came to see it as a complex and multi-tiered society in which the *bakufu*, the overarching political entity that bound together the various feudal states of early modern Japan, and *han*, or feudal states, existed as regional powers and subordinate groups organized their own communities on the town and village level. Importantly, these scholars noted that both regional powers and subordinate groups participated in the execution of public power. The participation of these groups, however, took place at different levels of society. During the 1990s, scholars conducted a range of studies on ‘peripheral’ social spheres. These studies focused on artisan and merchant guilds, religious and entertainment groups, and religious fundraising groups. In light of these new understandings, we can say that early modern Japanese society ‘was composed of various social groups that existed in a multi-layered and compound manner. These groups had a tendency to seek public recognition while remaining under the authority of the ruling class.’

Based on the above understanding of early modern society, this paper examines employment agents (*kuchiire*), who acted as mediators between different social classes and groups. Employment agents organized themselves in an effort to gain an officially recognized position in early modern Edo’s status system.

In working to develop a new understanding of early modern Japanese society, I have been strongly influenced by Nobuyuki Yoshida’s work on urban social history. In a paper entitled ‘Edo ni okeru yado no shosō’ (Different aspects of *yado* in Edo), Professor Yoshida examines the various types of lodging establishments in early modern Edo, such as *kujiyado* or *ryojin-yado*, *hyakushō-yado*, which were used during trials and for official purposes, *hitoyado* and *temayado*, both of which provided employment mediation services, *shōnin-yado*, which were used by merchants, *gureyado*, which were used by poor monks, and *kichinyado*. Through an examination of the temporary lodging characteristics of each type of *yado*, Yoshida elucidates the network of social relationships that developed around Edo’s early modern lodging establishments. Yoshida’s research helped to shed light on a range of relationships and connections ignored or overlooked in previous research.

\* Takashi Tsukada, Litt.D.  
Professor, Department of Japanese History, Graduate School of Literature and Human Sciences, Osaka City University  
3-3-138 Sugimoto, Sumiyoshi-ku, Osaka-shi, 558-8585 Japan  
tsukada@lit.osaka-cu.ac.jp

Thus, his research deals not only with ‘the various aspects of *yado* in Edo’ but also with the range of relationships that linked the townspeople of Edo to one another. Inspired by Yoshida’s analysis of Edo, I focused my attention on Osaka. Through my research, I demonstrated the existence in the 17<sup>th</sup> century Osaka of a group of employment agents that also provided lodging services. In the analysis below, I examine their development as a group.

## Introduction

In early modern society, ‘*yado*’ played an important role as places where people met and established contacts. When we hear the word ‘*yado*’, an image of the contemporary *hatago* inn immediately comes to mind. However, different *yado* had different functions. For example, *kujiyado* and *gōyado* were used for official business and during trials. *Hitoyado* and *temayado* served as employment brokerages and *shōnin-yado* and *toiya* (warehouse) mediated commercial transactions (Yoshida 1997). In this paper, I will focus on the employment mediation function of ‘*yado*’ and thereby offer a detailed examination of one aspect of the urban society in early modern Osaka.

First, I would like to provide a brief overview of early modern Osaka (Tsukada 2002). Osaka had a population of more than 400,000, making it early modern Japan’s second largest city. It was divided into more than 600 *chō* (the basic unit of early modern urban governance), which were collectively administered by local homeowners. *Chōdoshiyori* (city elders) were in charge of city affairs. They were selected from among the city’s homeowners. Although there were also many rental dwellings, tenants were excluded from local administration. The total population of Osaka’s 600 *chō* was more than 400,000. The city area was divided into three districts: Kita-gumi, Minami-gumi and Tenma-gumi. Each district was governed by a small number of general representatives, or *sōdoshiyori*. A *sōkai-sho* (community house) was established in each district and served as the seat of local administration.

Since Osaka was under the direct control of the Edo Shogunate (17<sup>th</sup> to 19<sup>th</sup> century), there were a relatively small number of retainers in the city. Unlike other castle towns, their residences occupied only a small part of the city area. However, in Osaka Castle, there were a large number of warriors. These warriors were placed under the control of the Osaka *jōdai* (mid-rank *fudai daimyō* who participated in the central government) and performed different functions related to castle security. They served as *jōban* (warriors who guarded the castle’s Tamatsukuri-guchi and Kyōbashi-guchi exits) and *ōban* (guard units consisting of 50 *hatamoto* that were stationed at outposts located on the eastern and western sides of the castle). The *ōban* were led by *hatamoto* known as *ōban-gashira* and a group of four *fudai daimyo* known as *kaban*.<sup>1</sup> In order to serve as *kaban*, *daimyo* were required to have an income of ten to twenty thousand *koku* (the basic unit to measure the area of feudal estate or the income of the warrior class). City governors known as *machi-bugyō* handled the administration of civil affairs. They conducted their affairs from official offices known as *bugyōsho*. There were two such offices in early modern Osaka: the eastern *bugyōsho* and the western *bugyōsho*. These *machi-bugyō* supervised clerks of warrior rank known as *yoriki*, who performed administrative duties at the city governor’s office, and lower-ranking warriors known as *dōshin*. In addition, many domains, mainly from western Japan, maintained storehouse-residential compounds inside the city known as *kurayashiki*. During the early modern period, there were more than 150 such *kurayashiki* in Osaka. Although they were relatively small in number, the presence of warriors should not be ignored when considering Osaka’s urban history.

## 1. Subordinates of *Banshū* and *Yado*

### *Reibure* of Osaka

There are very few extant documents that describe the material social conditions in 17<sup>th</sup> century Osaka. In my previous studies, I have frequently relied on town laws in order to elucidate the social conditions of a specific place. Here also, I will analyze *yado* and *kuchiire* through an examination of town laws. My analysis will focus centrally on orders issued by Osaka’s city governors, such as *reibure* and *machibure*.

1. There were twelve *ōban* groups in the whole Shogunate administration, and two of them were posted in Osaka and replaced by a new group every year. *Kaban* also had a shift of one year. *Jōban*, *ōban* and *kaban* are collectively called *banshū*.

In early modern Osaka, certain *machibure*, or municipal ordinances, were issued without revision on the same day every year. In this article, I refer to these ordinances as *reibure*, or repeated ordinances.<sup>2</sup> The practice of issuing *reibure* was well established by the late 17<sup>th</sup> century. Beginning in the early 18<sup>th</sup> century, approximately ten *reibure* were issued each year (Tsukada 1998).

Every year, on the eleventh day of the first month<sup>3</sup>, two *machibure* were issued. Among the oldest *reibure*, these ordinances can be traced as far back as the mid-17<sup>th</sup> century. One ordinance concerned the ‘Three acts of *goyō-hajime*’ and was intended for the *sōdoshiyori* of Osaka’s three districts. As I demonstrated in my previous studies, this ordinance was originally issued not as a *machibure*, but as an instruction to the city’s *sōdoshiyori*. However, since *sōdoshiyori* were ordered to communicate the ordinance’s content to the city’s three districts, such an instruction gradually came to be treated as a *machibure* (Tsukada 1998). Herein, I would like to examine a different *reibure* that was issued every year on the eleventh day of the first month.<sup>4</sup> A complete translation of the text of this *reibure* is as follows:

On the lodging of subordinates of *banshū* and those whose employment agreements will expire.

Article: It is prohibited to provide lodging in the city for subordinates of Osaka Castle’s *banshū*, including *jōban*, *ōban* and *kaban*, all of whom are responsible for the defense of the castle, whether they are *samurai* [who were employed by, but not a member of, the warrior class] or *komono* [who were from the lower rank than *samurai*], if they have lost employment.

Article: If a *hōkōnin*<sup>5</sup> who has lost employment commits theft or other crimes before finding a new master, the lodging provider will be held responsible.

Article: If, after the twentieth day of the second or eighth month [*degawari* date when employment contracts were renewed], lodging is provided for a *komono* or *chūgen* [a type of *hōkōnin*] who has not yet found new employment, the lodging provider will be punished. The *goningumi* [a group of five households in the neighborhood for which they were collectively responsible] in charge of the provider will be equally guilty.

Additional clause: While *hōkōnin* (*rokushaku* and *komono*) employed by townspeople may be released from employment before the twentieth day of the second or eighth month, they should not be fired at the whim of their masters after this date. This excludes cases in which their masters are not satisfied with them.

The above-mentioned instructions should be transmitted to each *chō*.

The eleventh day of the first month,  
Issued by Governors Hayato and Tanba

To the *sōdoshiyori* of the three districts

This *reibure* dates from Jōō 2 (1653), the year it first appeared. In Osaka, there were two deadlines (*degawari*) each year by which employment agreements had to be concluded: the twentieth day of the second and eighth months. Terms of service were generally half or one year in length.<sup>6</sup> However, in Kanbun 11 (1671), city authorities reduced the number of deadlines to one and changed the date of the deadline to the fifth day of the third month. This was done in an effort to bring local practice in Osaka in line with standard practice in Edo (the *machibure* of the twenty-second day of the second month, Kansei 7 (1795)). By Genroku 8 (1695), the Osaka city governor revived the practice of setting two deadlines each year. He selected the fifth day of the third month and the ninth month as the two deadlines. In 1695, however, while the first deadline selected was the fifth day of the third month, the second date selected was the tenth day of the ninth month.<sup>7</sup> In Kansei 7 (1795), the city governor reduced the number of

2. These *machibure* are listed chronologically in Volumes 3 and 4 of the *Osaka City History* (Osaka-shi shi). Unless otherwise stated, all *machibure* mentioned herein are from the Osaka City History.

3. All the dates are shown in the lunar calendar in this paper.

4. The text of this second *reibure* comes from the Osaka oshioki-dome that is a record currently stored at the Nakanoshima Library in Osaka.

5. *Hōkōnin* means employees in a household. In this paper, the term indicates those employed by the warrior class. There are different categories of *hōkōnin*, such as *wakatō*, *chūgen*, *komono* or *rokushaku* and *arashiko*. Their ranks descend in this order.

6. While there was only one deadline per year to conclude new employment agreements in Edo, in Osaka there were two deadlines per year. This may be related to the fact that *banshū* was replaced at the beginning of the eighth month. Shosaku Takagi points out that the *degawari* date was initially set in springtime in order to encourage *rōnin* (warrior without a fixed master) with only one-year contract to become a peasant, thereby securing the agricultural workforce (Takagi 1984). Added to this, in Osaka, when *banshū* was replaced in August, while their successors needed new employees, the subordinates of *banshū* returning to Edo lost their jobs. This was probably a reason why one of the *degawari* dates was fixed on the twentieth day of the eighth month.

7. Refer to the *machibure* of the eleventh day of the fifth month, Genroku 8 (1695).

deadlines to one per year. The new deadline selected was the fifth day of the third month.<sup>8</sup> Although the date by which employment agreements needed to be concluded was changed several times, the content of this *reibure* remained unchanged until the end of the Tokugawa period.

### ***Buke Hōkōnin and Yado***

In order to examine the content of this *reibure*, it becomes necessary to understand the meanings of the terms *samurai* and *ikkiori* (one-year employment). Shosaku Takagi explained both terms in detail in his 1984 article. According to Takagi, in *Mibun hōrei* (status laws) issued by Toyotomi Hideyoshi in Tenshō 19 (1591), the term *samurai* does not necessarily stand for a person of warrior status. Rather, it refers specifically to *wakatō* (*hōkōnin* of the highest rank). Takagi also pointed out that ‘*samurai, chūgen, komono, and arashiko* [*hōkōnin* of lower rank]’ were all included in the category of *buke hōkōnin*. He noted that from the beginning of the early modern period *buke hōkōnin* often made a one-year contract with their employer. *Buke hōkōnin* were not allowed to be in the city unless they had an employment contract whose deadline was established by the authorities. Those with a one-year contract were accepted. ‘Subordinates’ of *banshū* in the first article of this *reibure* refers to all the *buke hōkōnin* ranging from *samurai* (i.e. *wakatō*) to *komono*.

Based on the above-mentioned facts, the three articles shown above can be reinterpreted as follows:

Article 1: It is forbidden to provide lodging in the city for *hōkōnin* of Osaka Castle’s *banshū* if they have been released from their employment contracts regardless of whether they are *samurai* or *komono*.

Article 2: If a *hōkōnin* who has lost employment commits theft or other crimes before finding a new master, the lodging provider will be held responsible.

Article 3: If, after the twentieth day of the second or eighth month (*degawari* date), lodging is provided for a master-less *hōkōnin* (*komono* or *chūgen*), the lodging provider will be punished. The *goningumi* in charge of the provider will be held equally guilty.

Additional clause: While *hōkōnin* employed by townspeople may be released from employment before the twentieth day of the second or eighth months, they should not be fired at the whim of their masters after this date. This excludes cases in which their masters are not satisfied with them.

It is clear that these three articles deal mainly with *buke hōkōnin*. Articles 2 and 3 are based on the practice of *degawari*. While lodging providers were allowed to accommodate *hōkōnin* who were seeking new employment before the *degawari* date, Article 3 prohibits lodging providers from doing so after the *degawari* date. Even before the date, if a *hōkōnin* committed a crime, the lodging provider who accommodated the *hōkōnin* would also be punished (Article 2).

The additional clause following Article 3 mentions the *hōkōnin* employed by townspeople. According to this clause, it was forbidden to release *hōkōnin* from employment at the whim of their employers after the *degawari* date. This measure was adopted probably because the amount of available employment for *hōkōnin* decreased after the *degawari* period. It was thus difficult for *hōkōnin* without employment to find a job after the *degawari* date. This implies that the *degawari* system was initially intended for *buke hōkōnin* and that *hōkōnin*, employed by townspeople, represented a similar kind of workforce. With regards to the latter type of *hōkōnin*, they are referred to as *rokushaku* and *komono* in Article 3, which suggests that they did not deal with shop management but worked in kitchens. They were exactly what Nobuyuki Yoshida called ‘*hiyōsō*’<sup>9</sup> (Yoshida 1984).

This leads us to understand that Article 1 forbids renting lodging for *buke hōkōnin* who were fired outside the regular *degawari* date. A provision of lodging permitted in Articles 2 and 3 was thus meant for a short period of time before the *degawari* date. On the other hand employers basically had the right to fire their subordinates any time they wished.

In this way, we can understand all the articles coherently. While this *reibure* was addressed to *hōkōnin* employed by *banshū*, it goes without saying that the ordinance also affects *buke hōkōnin* employed in depots of different *han* or feudal states.

Then, what does ‘provide lodging (*yado*)’ mean? It means to provide temporary lodging for those who were seeking a new employment during the *degawari* periods, not to have a fixed tenant for a longer period of time (according to *machibure* concerning other matters, it seems that there were cases where a lodging provider was a homeowner

8. Refer to the *machibure* of the twenty-second day of the second month, Kansei 7 (1795).

9. *Hiyōsō* means unskilled manual workforce. Unlike laborers in capitalist society, they worked in the service sector.

leasing his house). Ordinary homeowners or tenants may have lodged a third person in their dwellings. However, there seems to be other background on this practice.

## 2. The Possibility of *Hitoyado*

### *Hitoyado* in Edo

In order to figure out the meaning of ‘provide lodging (*yado*)’ in the above-mentioned *reibure*, I would like to first take a look at the argument presented by Nobuyuki Yoshida (Yoshida 1997). Yoshida clarified the mechanism of *hitoyado*, which acted as a sort of employment agent by introducing a variety of *hiyōsō*, mainly *buke hōkōnin*, to employers (this introduction was called *kuchiire*). After the 18<sup>th</sup> century, there were around 200 to 400 *hitoyado*, divided into 11 groups (*bangumi*). They received commission fees (*kōsen*) by introducing *hōkōnin* to administrative offices of the *bakufu* and residences of *han* or feudal states. *Hitoyado* provided lodging for those seeking for employment as *yoriko* or *deishū* (fellow lodger). That is why these institutions were called *hitoyado* (literally ‘people’s *yado*’). Although Yoshida points out that *hitoyado* existed without doubt in Edo by the first half of the 17<sup>th</sup> century, he does not present the details. Thus I would like to explore the details using *machibure* issued in Edo that dealt with *degawari hōkōnin* (Table 1).

**Table 1: *Machibure* Related to *Ikkiori* and *Degawari* (mid-17th century)**

| Date<br>[Japanese calendar year,<br>month/day]  | Content   |
|---|---|
| <b>Keian 2, 1/12</b>  | Continuation of employment due to pilgrimage to Nikko   |
| <b>Shōō 2, 1/28</b><br><b>9/29</b>  | <i>Degawari</i> before the fifteenth day of the second month<br><i>Yado</i> of day laborers   |
| <b>Meireki 2, 2/3</b><br><b>3, 1/25</b><br><b>30</b><br><b>12/17</b><br><b>20</b>   | <i>Degawari</i> on the twentieth day of the second month<br>Continuation of employment due to great fire<br>Continuation of employment due to great fire<br><i>Yado</i> of <i>rōnin</i> (warriors without masters)<br>Continuation of employment  |
| <b>Manji 2, 1/18</b><br><b>2/16</b><br><b>21</b><br><b>7/28</b><br><b>8/2</b><br><b>3, 2/17</b><br><b>29</b>  | <i>Degawari</i> on the twentieth day of the second month<br><i>Degawari</i> on the twentieth day of the second month<br>Prohibition of lodging <i>rōnin</i> with <i>ikkiori</i> contract in <i>yado</i><br><i>Ukenin</i> of <i>hōkōnin</i><br>11 articles concerning <i>hōkōnin</i><br><i>Degawari</i> on the twentieth day of the second month<br><i>Rōnin</i> with <i>ikkiori</i> contract  |
| <b>Kanbun 3, 1/29</b><br><b>5, 1/19</b><br><b>10/3</b><br><b>6, 1/13</b><br><b>13</b><br><b>3/9</b><br><b>10/9</b><br><b>11/3</b><br><b>7, 1/22</b><br><b>11/11</b><br><b>8, 1/27</b><br><b>12/26</b><br><b>9, 1/10</b><br><b>11, 2/ -</b><br><b>12, 1/20</b> | <i>Degawari</i> date<br><i>Degawari</i> on the thirtieth day of the second month<br>Those intending to present employment should have an additional guarantor<br><i>Degawari</i> on the thirtieth day of the second month<br>Additional guarantor<br><i>Rōnin</i> with <i>ikkiori</i> contract<br><i>Deishū</i> at <i>hitouke</i><br>Disappearance of <i>hōkōnin</i> and <i>ukenin</i><br>Additional guarantor, continuation of employment due to pilgrimage to Nikko, disappearance<br><i>Deishū</i> at <i>hitouke</i><br><i>Degawari</i> on the thirtieth day of the second month, disappearance, <i>deishū</i><br><i>Hōkōnin</i> of <i>hatamoto</i> , <i>degawari</i> on the fifth day of the third month<br><i>Degawari</i> of subordinates of townspeople also on the fifth day of the third month<br><i>Degawari</i><br><i>Degawari</i> around the country also on the fifth day of the third month |

Source: *Edo Machibure Shūsei*, Vol. 1, Hanawa Shobō, 1994.

Table 1 is a list of *machibure* dealing with *ikkiori* and *degawari*, which were issued in Edo around the mid-17<sup>th</sup> century. The following, also included in the list, is the *machibure* issued on the twenty-seventh day of the first month

of Kanbun 8 (1668) (*Edo Machibure Shūsei*, Vol. 1, No. 642).

Article: As with other years, *hōkōnin* with one-year contract should decide for a new employment by the end of the second month. After this date, *yado* [lodging] should not be provided for them.

Additional clause: As has been instructed since last year, one can become *hitouke* [guarantor] only upon securing an identifiable person—a relative, fellow countryman, friend or acquaintance of the would-be employee—as an additional guarantor. He should never become *hitouke* and introduce employment to those he has never met or of whom he has no clear knowledge about their future.

[The second article is omitted.]

Article: There have been cases where many misbehaving persons were lodged as *deishū* in rented houses and shops in town. Introducing them to employment by becoming their guarantors caused many conflicts. Therefore, as has been instructed before, it is forbidden to keep even one *deishū* in such cases. If the person in question is an acquaintance and if the tenant wishes to lodge the person as his *deishū*, then he should contact the homeowner and lodge the person after undergoing the same procedure as a regular tenant. Those who secretly keep *deishū* without any consent of the homeowner will be severely punished.

The twenty-seventh day of the first month of the Year of the Monkey

[The subsequent written agreement is omitted.]

As is shown on Table 1, in Edo during this period, there was one *degawari* date per year, somewhere between the fifteenth day of the second month and the fifth day of the third month, depending on the year. In Kanbun 8 (1668), an order was issued to perform *degawari* by the last day of the second month. Article 1 forbids renting lodging after this date and instructs guarantors to secure a reliable additional guarantor. Since there were tenants who kept many *deishū*, thus causing conflicts over guarantee, in the third article they are forbidden to keep any *deishū* (it is admitted to lodge close acquaintances after presenting identification reference directly to the homeowner).

Additionally in the case of Edo, the system of *degawari* seems to have involved *buke hōkōnin* primarily. In Kanbun 9 (1669) *degawari* date was changed to the fifth day of the third month. This is known from the *machibure* issued on the twenty-sixth day of the twelfth month of the previous year, which instructs that although ‘*wakatō, komono, chūgen* with *ikkiori* contract’ are usually supposed to terminate their employments by the second day [*sic*] of the second month<sup>10</sup>, *hōkōnin* of *hatamoto* should be employed until the fifth day of the third month. On the tenth day of the first month of Kanbun 9, the same instruction was given to the subordinates of townspeople. It provided that those with contracts from the previous year should be employed until the fifth day of the third month and that those who would newly enter the household that spring should have contracts until the fifth day of the third month of the next year. It can be inferred from this that *hōkōnin* with *ikkiori* primarily meant *buke hōkōnin* and partly included *hōkōnin* (as kitchen workers) for townspeople.

These regulations on *degawari* concerning *buke hōkōnin* are completely identical to those issued in Osaka in that it was forbidden to rent lodging after the deadline for new employment agreement. Moreover, the *machibure* mentioned above suggests that the person who rented lodging became an *ukenin* [guarantor] of *hōkōnin*. In this case, it was provided that the person should have another reliable person as an additional guarantor. Such an additional guarantor could be a close acquaintance or relative of the would-be *hōkōnin* who could fully guarantee him/her.<sup>11</sup> This means that the lodging provider who became *ukenin* was not really acquainted with *hōkōnin*. Thus, it is not that a lodging provider became *ukenin* of *hōkōnin* whom he had already known, but a lodging provider introduced employment to job-seekers as a professional employment agent called *kuchiire toseinin*.

According to the third article of the *machibure*, those who kept *itazuramono* (rogues) as *deishū* introduced them to employment and caused conflicts. This means that they became *ukenin* and introduced *deishū* to employers. Then *deishū* were job-seekers and those mentioned in the third article lodged them for a while and introduced them to employment (an act of *kuchiire*). Although the term ‘*hitoyado*’ is not mentioned here, their business practice was exactly the same as *hitoyado*. It is worth noting that these equivalents of *hitoyado* were also assumed to be tenants

10. The official date was the twentieth day of the second month.

11. The practice of becoming *ukenin* by procuring an additional guarantor can also be observed in the system of *yatoinin ukeyado* (employment agents with the function of lodging) in Osaka at the beginning of the Meiji era (1868-1912) (Ashita Saga 2002). In the system of *ieukenin nakama* (a guild of guarantors who were specialized in the house-renting business and also leased houses) of Osaka, *ieukenin* (guarantors mentioned above) were in principle required to become *ukenin* by finding an additional guarantor (Kazue Nishimura 2001). These practices suggest that *ieukenin* also mediated the renting of lodging (Koichi Tsukada 2005). The practice of securing an additional guarantor was indispensable in various mediating businesses. Thus analyzing various cases from a similar point of view would broaden our understanding.

of shops and land.

Thus *hitoyado* definitely prevailed in Edo by the mid-17<sup>th</sup> century, as Yoshida pointed out. It can be inferred from this that lodging providers in the above-mentioned *reibure* of Osaka played a similar role as *hitoyado*.

### ***Kuchiire Tosei (The Kuchiire Business) in Osaka***

Let us now return to the *reibure* of Osaka. According to the *reibure*, it was permitted to lodge *buke hōkōnin* looking for new employment for (not as long) a period of time before the *degawari* date. But once the date passed, it was no longer allowed. It can thus be assumed that the lodger was an equivalent to *deishū* of Edo and that the lodging provider was a kind of employment agent equivalent to *hitoyado*.

The subjects of such regulations were not limited to those making their living in the *kuchiire* business. It could well happen that ordinary town residents, whether they were homeowners or tenants, lodged ‘would-be subordinates of *banshū*’ in their dwellings for some reason. According to Nobuyuki Yoshida, in Edo after the 18<sup>th</sup> century, *shirōto-yado* that introduced employment to less than ten acquaintances was tolerated, besides officially recognized *bangumi hitoyado* (Yoshida 1997). The same could be true in Osaka.

In the historical documents of Doshōmachi 3-chome (kept in the Osaka Prefectural Nakanoshima Library), there are some *shūshi ninbetsuchō* (the registers of individuals’ religious affiliation) covering from the mid-17<sup>th</sup> century until the end of the Shogunate period. From Kanbun 10 (1670) onward, three articles were written at the beginning of the register. They declared that no registered individuals were involved in Christianity, gambling, or prostitution. Another three articles were added to the beginning in Tenna 2 (1682). I would like to quote two of them:

Article: It is not allowed to rent lodging to the *chūgen* or *komono* who have been released of employment by the *banshū* of Osaka Castle. It is also forbidden to lodge anybody who is not registered in *teraukejō* [i.e. *shūshi ninbetsuchō*].

Article: It is not allowed to carelessly lodge others in the capacity of *hitoyado*, become their *ukenin* or keep their belongings. Those whose occupations are unknown should be reported [to the governor’s office] after investigation.

The *reibure* mentioned earlier was intended for all three districts of Osaka. This is because there were professional employment agents among tenants in town and therefore because the *reibure* needed to be notified area-wide. But it was also intended to control other townspeople that happened to lodge a third person. The *shūshi ninbetsuchō* of Doshōmachi 3-chome registered the names of homeowners, tenants, their families and *hōkōnin*. The first article that forbade lodging those unregistered for even one night was applied to all the residents and shows this aspect more directly.

These two articles demonstrate even more clearly what we have seen so far in two respects. First, they deal with the *buke hōkōnin* (*chūgen* and *komono*) released of employment by the *banshū* of Osaka Castle and thus correspond to the first article of the *reibure*. Second, they are associated with the profession of *hitoyado*. This clearly shows that those who rented lodging to *buke hōkōnin* with *ikkiori* contract practiced *kuchiire* that was also called *hitoyado*. By this, we can confirm that the *reibure* had already acknowledged the existence of *hitoyado* introducing *hōkōnin* to *banshū* when it was first issued.

The *reibure* continued to be issued without much change until the end of the Shogunate period. During the latter half of the 18<sup>th</sup> century, however, changes were made to the three articles written at the beginning of the *shūshi ninbetsuchō* of Doshōmachi 3-chome. Although these three articles stayed in effect until An’ei 5 (1776), the document dating from An’ei 9 replaced them by the following.

Article: If there are comings and goings besides people registered in *teraukejō*, they should be immediately reported to the town administration and registered without mistake. It is strictly forbidden to lodge people without fixed addresses even for one night. It is not allowed to carelessly lodge people in the capacity of *hitoyado* or become their *ukenin*. In addition, those whose occupations are unknown should be promptly verified by *goningumi*.

Here, *hōkōnin* of Osaka Castle’s *banshū* are not clearly mentioned as the subjects of lodging regulations. Although this article still states that one should not lodge those who are not registered in *teraukejō* (i.e. the present document), this regulation is now put in more general terms than the previous articles that explicitly mentioned *buke hōkōnin* with *ikkiori*. In addition to that, this article provides that, as before, one should not get lightly involved in

the *hitoyado* business. It can thus be inferred that, although *hitoyado* dealt mainly with *buke hōkōnin*, the business of employment agent developed to the extent of dealing with other categories of job-seekers as well.

However, neither above-mentioned regulations nor any articles on Christians, gamblers or prostitutes appear in the *shūshi ninbetsuchō* of Kikuyachō (Heiichiro Sakamoto and Mataji Miyamoto (ed.) *Osaka Kikuyachō Shūshi ninbetsuchō*, Vols. 1-7). This indicates that regulations written in the *shūshi ninbetsuchō* of Doshōmachi 3-chome were not applied to all three districts of Osaka but that each *chō* had its own version. Nonetheless, the change in the Doshōmachi 3-chome document probably reflects a general development of the *hitoyado* business.

After the change was made in the second half of the 18<sup>th</sup> century, the foreword of the *shūshi ninbetsuchō* of Doshōmachi 3-chome remained the same until the 19<sup>th</sup> century. I would now like to examine the situation after the change in the next chapter.

### 3. An Application for the Post of *Hōkōnin Kimoiri Sōdai* (Supervisor of Employment Agents)

#### The Content of the Application

In the latter half of the 18<sup>th</sup> century, employment agents in Osaka started to form guilds. In order to explore its process in this chapter, let us first take a look at application for the post of *hōkōnin kimoiri sōdai* that prompted the creation of guilds. Both in the third and twelfth months of Meiwa 8 (1771), applications for the post of *hōkōnin kimoiri sōdai* were filed, and the *chō* of the three districts were asked for their opinions concerning the matter (the record of the third and twelfth months, Meiwa 8 in *Osaka-shi-shi*, Vol. 3).

On the twentieth day of the third month, the governor's office sent the first inquiry to the towns regarding an application filed by a townsman of Edo. According to the communication, the applicant claimed that nobody was currently overseeing the *kuchiire* business for *hōkōnin* in Osaka, causing serious confusion to both the employers and the employees. He proposed that if he were appointed as a *hōkōnin kimoiri sōdai*, he would supervise the *kuchiire* agents working in two hundred houses in the three districts and surrounding urbanized territories, verify the identity of *hōkōnin* and put his seal to guarantee letters. The applicant classifies the following types of *hōkōnin*.

- (a) *Hōkōnin* working as a wet nurse or as a serving woman in a tea house. Although it has been customary for *hitoyado* to receive a ten percent commission fee from both the employer and the employee, the commission fee would be reduced to half.
- (b) *Hōkōnin* with a half-year contract previously paid the sum of three *momme* [a unit of silver currency] as a commission fee. This would be reduced to half. If his/her employment contract is extended, no additional commission fee would be charged. However, when a *nenki hōkōnin* [who is employed for a longer term than *hōkōnin* with *degawari* contract] starts working for the first time, *hōkōnin kimoiri sōdai* would receive a commission fee.
- (c) Employment of *buke hōkōnin* would be left in the hands of agents according to the earlier practices.

The second inquiry was sent to the towns on the seventh day of the twelfth month. Its content matches exactly the first inquiry of the third month, if a little more detailed. Although the identity of the applicant is not explicitly mentioned in the second inquiry, there is a phrase stating, 'As I have no knowledge of the formalities regarding employment in warrior households in Osaka, it would remain as before.' This clearly shows that the applicant was not from Osaka. As in the first inquiry, the employment practice surrounding *buke hōkōnin* was not expected to change. Therefore, we can safely say that these two inquiries dealt with one and the same matter. I would now like to examine the meanings of the above-mentioned three types of *hōkōnin* with the help of the inquiry of the twelfth month.

Type (a) is described in the inquiry of the twelfth month as a prostitute, a serving woman in a tea house, a woman working in a public bath to wash her client's hair and a serving woman in a *hatago* inn. This suggests the existence of procurers, who practiced *kuchiire* for prostitutes and for women of similar occupations. Kenji Yahisa, who studied *meshimori hatago* inns or prostitution houses in Hirakata post town, pointed out that there were procurers dealing with *meshimori* courtesans who came to *hatago* inns in Hirakata from tea houses in Osaka (Yahisa 1999). The application seen in the inquiries was based on the existence of *kuchiire* agents as such procurers.

*Kuchiire* for *hōkōnin* with a half-year contract is mentioned in (b), but this is separate from the employment issue of *buke hōkōnin* that is mentioned in (c). According to the inquiry of the twelfth month, the applicant asked for permission to establish a guild of employment agents named *hitooki* and to be appointed as its representative/supervisor, *kimoiri sōdai*. *Hitooki* existed in different *chō* of Osaka and introduced work to those looking for one-year or half-year employment. They seem to have had similar functions as *hitoyado* that lodged job-seekers as *yoriko* or *deishū* and introduced them to employers. It seems unlikely that *hitooki* were totally separated from the agents dealing with *buke hōkōnin* as written in (c). This clause was probably added in order to separate the matter of *buke hōkōnin* and secure permission. This addition might also mean that the importance of *buke hōkōnin* was relatively declining in the labor market of *hiyōsō* while a demand for short-term employees was rising among townspeople. According to another study by Kenji Yahisa on a *nakama* guild of sake producers, there was a *kuchiire* guild after the mid-18<sup>th</sup> century which was specialized in introducing workers such as rice polishers (not master brewers called *tōji*) to sake producers (Yahisa 2004). This also shows an aspect of the declining importance of *buke hōkōnin* in the labor market of *hiyōsō*.

*Nenki hōkōnin* mentioned in (b) are probably employees who were involved in the businesses run by merchant households. They were usually employed through personal connections. By mentioning their case in the second clause, the applicant probably attempted to relate two proposals: one is that if a *hōkōnin* with short-term employment extended his/her contract, no commission fee would be charged; the other is that in the case of long-term *hōkōnin*, *kimoiri sōdai* would receive a commission fee only at the beginning and not after the second year (although this implies that long-term *hōkōnin* paid a commission fee every year during their contract, the practice is not true). He added these proposals as if they could have been placed under the same logic. However, as mentioned above, such long-term *hōkōnin* were usually employed not through *kuchiire* but through personal connections. The applicant probably wished to extract profits from the fields where *kuchiire* agents had not yet been involved. This is why one of the *chō* replied to the inquiry of the twelfth month that it was customary to pay no commission fee if a contract was made through recommendation of 'relatives or close acquaintances' although the fee was charged for a contract made through *kimoiri*.

### The Nature of the Application

In Osaka after the mid-18<sup>th</sup> century, there already existed various types of *kuchiire* business, such as procurers for female workers and agents for *hōkōnin* of *hiyōsō* (who worked for both warrior class and townspeople and were further subdivided). There were also *hōkōnin* who were employed without *kuchiire*'s introduction (such as employees in the merchant business). Based on such employment practices, a townsman from Edo, thus a complete outsider, applied for *kimoiri sōdai*. He did it under the pretext of supervising the entire business by ignoring all these distinctions and even scheming to include those employed without *kuchiire*'s introduction. So far there has been no record showing the application was accepted. It is difficult to believe that those already in the *kuchiire* business and any *chō* would have accepted it; hence the outcome is not surprising.

## 4. Degawari Hōkōnin and the Kuchiire Business

### Nakama Guilds of Employment Agents

Although groups of professional employment agents were not acknowledged as official guilds by the governor's office, they probably formed guilds (*nakama*) at different levels in the latter half of the 18<sup>th</sup> century. For example, in Kyōhō 15 (1730) there were 30 guilds of employment agents that introduced workers to sake producers. This number dropped to 18 in Meiwa 6 (1769) and further to 12 in Kansei 12 (1800) (Yahisa 2004). Despite the decrease, 9 guilds are known to have had their own rules in Bunka 9 (1812). This shows that there were spontaneously developed guilds related to the sake-production business. Although no other guilds are known to us so far, more may have existed.

The governor's office proceeded to acknowledge these guilds officially, after the *machibure* concerning *degawari* date was issued on the twenty-second day of the second month of Kansei 7 (1795). This *machibure* provided that in Osaka there used to be two *degawari* dates per year for workers with *ikkiori* contract: the fifth day of the third month and the tenth day of the ninth month but that they were henceforth reduced to one date per year: the fifth day of the third month. As mentioned earlier, in the mid-17<sup>th</sup> century, there were two *degawari* dates per year: the twentieth day of the second and eighth months. In Kanbun 11 (1671), they were reduced to one date according to practices in Edo: the fifth day of the third month. It was again changed back to two dates per year: the fifth day of the third and ninth

months. In Genroku 8 (1695), the dates were changed to the fifth day of the third month and the tenth day of the ninth month.

*Degawari* date was set once a year due to the following concerns. It was claimed that *hōkōnin* used to behave well and worked hard throughout the contract period even for six months because a person of heart was highly valued in the old days, but that they were becoming less serious and negligent of their current duties because they tended to become preoccupied with finding their next job a few months after they were hired. It was also claimed that women looking for employment stayed at *kuchiire* lodgings for too long a time and loosened their moral values.

Following this change of *degawari* date and the *machibure* concerning professional employment agents, a series of *machibure* confirming their contents were issued in the ninth month of Kansei 12 (1800), on the seventeenth day of the third month of Bunsei 3 (1820) and on the thirteenth day of the second month of Tempō 13 (1842). The *machibure* of Kansei 12 is particularly worth noting. It stated that if employment agents were inappropriately controlled and if somebody from the exterior filed an application for a plan to supervise them, then permission to become a supervisor might be granted to the applicant. Thus employment agents were warned that if they did not properly supervise their business, permission might be granted to an outsider who would submit a plan for effective supervision, as in the above-mentioned case of the Meiwa era. This shows that the governor's office acknowledged the significance of the *kuchiire* business 'historically' rooted in society, while such an application for *kimoiri sōdai* as mentioned earlier was unacceptable to the agents.

### ***Shikimoku-chō*, the Directory of a Guild**

In the first month of Ansei 2 (1855), two directories called *Shikimoku-chō* and *Mōshiwase ren'in-chō* were compiled by a guild of employment agents (*hōkōnin kuchiire tosei ninchū*). These directories have survived until today ('Sako Papers,' Museum of Commercial History, Osaka University of Commerce). Professional employment agents shown in Table 2 signed their names and pressed their seals on them. These directories tell us that the guild of employment agents was officially recognized at that time and how it actually functioned.

Let us first take a closer look at *Shikimoku-chō*. At the beginning, the directory described *kōtatsu* or orders issued by governors that dated from the second month of Kansei 7 (1795), the ninth month of Kansei 12 (1800), the third month of Bunsei 3 (1820) and the thirteenth day of the second month of Tempō 13 (1842). They are followed by a declaration that 'we will all respect the contents of these *furegaki* and will not perform any dishonest acts. As a sign of our sincerity, we will all press our seals.' Here, *kōtatsu* is described as *furegaki*, an ordinance of the governors. What follows the declaration is shown in Table 3, a list of the sums of money to be paid to the governor's office and *sōkai-sho* (a chamber of each *kumi* or community of the three districts). The payment would be made on the New Year and on the first day of the eighth month when guild members visited the office and chambers for seasonal greetings. After the list, there are seals pressed by those shown in Table 2, such as Tanakaya Kyūemon, tenant of Harimaya Kakubei, from Azuchimachi 2-chome.

These are the contents of *Shikimoku-chō*. Four *kōtatsu* described at the beginning of the directory correspond to what I presented earlier as the *machibure* concerning *degawari* date and professional employment agents. Thus the directory cited all pertinent *machibure* issued earlier than the directory and promised observance of them. The subsequent description of seasonal greetings to the governor's office and *sōkai-sho* and rules on the payment indicates that this guild was officially acknowledged by the office.

Such official recognition had not yet been achieved in Meiwa 8 (1771). The *Shikimoku-chō* gives us a clue to know when it was achieved. It can be inferred that when the first written *machibure*, i.e. the *kōtatsu* of the second month of Kansei 7 (1795), was issued, the governor's office officially recognized the guild to make it observe the *machibure*. Probably the *ren'in-chō*, a seal-directory of all the members who took oath to observe the rules, was also compiled at the same time. This is why the second *kōtatsu* of Kansei 12 (1800) includes phrases suggesting certain social acceptance of the guild. However, in Tempo 13 (1842), all official guilds including that of employment agents were dissolved as part of the Tempo Reform<sup>12</sup>. This measure was withdrawn after Kaei 4 (1851), leading to their reestablishment. The guild of employment agents in Osaka was also reestablished in Ansei 2 (1855), and *Shikimoku-chō* and *Mōshiwase ren'in-chō* were seemingly newly compiled on the occasion. Guild members probably attempted to reaffirm the identity of the guild by reconfirming a series of *machibure* which achieved the first official recognition of their guild. I believe that this is the reason why the four *machibure* were placed at the beginning of the directory. Subsequently, when members changed, pieces of paper were glued on the section where seals were pressed, showing that this directory was actually used for management of the guild.

12. The Tempo Reform is the political reform that was carried out to improve the impoverishment of towns and rural areas. However, since the adopted measures did not reflect reality, the reform failed.

**Table 2: List of *Hōkōnin Kuchiire Toseinin* (Professional Employment Agents)**

| No. | <i>Chō</i> name    | Homeowner's or property manager's name   | Agent's name       | Seal (+: sealed) | Remark   |
|-----|--------------------|--|--------------------|------------------|--|
| 1   | Azuchimachi 2      | Harimaya Kakubei<br>(property manager)   | Tanakaya Kyūemon   | +                |  |
| 2   | Aburamachi 2       | Zeniya Yasuke<br>(property manager)      | Kawachiya Kikujirō | +                |  |
|     | Kajiyamachi 2      | Hakoya Jinsuke                           | Kagaya Kiyosaku    | +                | 1st paper attachment<br>Change of name in 1st month of Ansei 5 |
|     | Kajiyamachi 2      | Hakoya Jinsuke                           | Kawachiya Chōbei   |                  | 2nd paper attachment   |
| 3   | Andōjimachi 1      | Kawachiya Kyūemon                        | Izumiya Yasaburō   | +                |  |
| 4   | Uchihonmachi 2     | Enryūji Temple                           | Kyōya Iwakichi     | +                |  |
|     | Uchihonmachi 2     | Enryūji Temple                           | Kyōya Tokumatsu    | +                | 1st paper attachment<br>Change of name in 2nd month of Ansei 5 |
|     |                    |  |                    | +                | 2nd paper attachment<br>(signature only)                       |
|     | Uchihonmachi 2     | Enryūji Temple                           | Enamiya Kashichi   | +                | 3rd paper attachment   |
| 5   | Aburamachi 3       | Kawachiya Zenpachi<br>(property manager) | Awaya Heisuke      | +                |  |
| 6   | Yanagimachi        | Izumiya Kichiemon<br>(property manager)  | Aboshiya Ichizō    | +                |  |
|     |                    |  |                    | +                | 1st paper attachment<br>(signature only)                       |
|     | Yanagimachi        | Izumiya Gihei<br>(property manager)      | Igaya Gihee        |                  | 2nd paper attachment<br>Renewed on 20th of 11th month, Bunkū 2 |
| 7   | Matsumotomachi     | Furukaneya Kihei                         | Kawachiya Kishichi | +                |  |
| 8   | Shiragamachi       | Izumiya Jihei                            | Matsuya Hanbei     | +                |  |
| 9   | Yazaemonmachi      | Kurumaya Gen'uemon                       | Echizenya Uhei     | +                |  |
| 10  | Minami Nabeyamachi | Kashiharaya Zenbei                       | Aboshiya Unosuke   | +                | Seal pressed instead by Chūbei                                 |

|    |                          |                                       |                       |   |                                   |
|----|--------------------------|---------------------------------------|-----------------------|---|-----------------------------------|
| 11 | Tachibanamachi           | Tanbaya Heibei (property manager)     | Yamatoya Isaburō      | + |                                   |
| 12 | Kyōmachibori 4           | Masuya Jihei (property manager)       | Kitaguniya Shinzaburō | + |                                   |
| 13 | Kaiyamachi               | Sakuraiya Sahei                       | Himejiya Hanbei       | + |                                   |
| 14 | Jōanuramachi             | Yamadaya Kohei (property manager)     | Osakaya Kihei         | + |                                   |
| 15 | Kōraibashi 2             | Tamaya Sahei (property manager)       | Tomitaya Kasuke       | + |                                   |
|    |                          | Kawachiya Sōbei (property manager)    | Izumiya Yasuzō        | + | 1st paper attachment              |
| 16 | Ōsawamachi               | Sashimonoya Shinbei                   | Yamadaya Zen'nosuke   | + |                                   |
| 17 | Kitatanimachi            | Haya Jūbei (property manager)         | Hiroshimaya Yahei     | + |                                   |
| 18 | Minami Nōninmachi 2      | Awaya Shinbei (property manager)      | Tajimaya Yasube       | + |                                   |
| 19 | Bingochō 5               | Matsuya Rizaemon (property manager)   | Akashiya Kihei        | + |                                   |
| 20 | Minami Morimachi         | Izumiya Eizou                         | Kawachiya Kyūbei      | + |                                   |
|    |                          |                                       | Kawachiya Katsujirō   |   | 1st paper attachment<br>Name only |
| 21 | Hatsusemachi             | Kuwanaya Kichiemon                    | Yorozuya Zenshichi    | + |                                   |
| 22 | Kōraibashi 3             | Beniya Tokubei (property manager)     | Izumiya Magoshichi    | + |                                   |
| 23 | Awajimachi 2             | Kiya Jihei (property manager)         | Harimaya Kyūbei       | + |                                   |
| 24 | Minami Kyūtarōmachi 6    | Echizen'ya Shōsuke (property manager) | Kawachiya Risuke      | + |                                   |
| 25 | Tenma Kūshinmachi        | (homeowner)                           | Kinokuniya Kasuke     | + |                                   |
| 26 | Tenma 7                  | Osakaya Ichiemon (property manager)   | Ibarakiya Kōsuke      | + |                                   |
| 27 | Hontenmamachi            | Nagahamaya Yaemon (property manager)  | Akashiya Kyūzō        | + |                                   |
| 28 | Kyūzaemonmachi           | Kawachiya Rihei (property manager)    | Megusuriya Jinbei     | + |                                   |
| 29 | Edobori 1                | Osakaya Gen'emon                      | Itamiya Kasuke        | + |                                   |
| 30 | Shinmachi Sadoshimamachi | Tobaya Han'emon (property manager)    | Kinokuniya Seishichi  | + |                                   |
| 31 | Kita shinchi 1 Uramachi  | Komeya Yasubei                        | Awaya Tsuneshichi     | + |                                   |
| 32 | Dōjima Shinchi Naka 1    | Sakaiya Fujisuke (property manager)   | Kawachiya Yōzō        | + |                                   |
| 33 | Furutemachi              | Takashimaya Yahei                     | Bizen'ya Heisuke      | + |                                   |
| 34 | Uchihoneyachō            | Buzen'ya Tokugorō                     | Nomuraya Kinbei       | + |                                   |

|  |                                       |   |                    |   |  |
|--|---------------------------------------|---|--------------------|---|--|
| 35   | Shimamachi 2                          | Momen'ya Gen'emon                                     | Sanukiya Chūbei    | + |  |
| 36   | Dōjima Shinchi Ura 2                  | Tenmaya Mansuke (property manager)                    | Tomitaya Isuke     | + |  |
| 37   | Dōjima Shinchi Naka 1                 | Izumiya Yasaburō (property manager)                   | Ōmiya Ihei         | + |  |
| 38   | Nayamachi                             | Nakaya Hirosuke                                       | Yakataya Risuke    | + |  |
| 39   | Andōjimachi 1                         | Kameya Zenzaemon                                      | Naraya Hikoshichi  | + |  |
| 40   | Dōjima Shinchi Kitamachi              | Men'ya Gohei (property manager)                       | Tanbaya Shōsuke    | + |  |
| 41   | Tachibana Dōri 8                      | Harimaya Seijirō                                      | Nanbuya Rihei      | + | Not mentioned in <i>Mōshiwase ren'in-chō</i>                                 |
| 42   | Tachibana Dōri 8                      | Yamadaya Jirobei                                      | Awajiya Kiyosuke   | + | Not mentioned in <i>Mōshiwase ren'in-chō</i>                                 |
| 43   | Minami Nōnin 2                        | Izumiya Gosaburō, (stamp pressed instead by Tōzaemon) | Awajiya Genbei     | + |  |
| 44   | Kōjimachi                             | Harimaya Kōhachi                                      | Mitaya Seibei      | + |  |
| 45   | Nagahamachō                           | Kinokuniya Heibei                                     | Kawachiya Kiyosuke | + |  |
| 46   | Junkeimachi 3                         | Hiranoya Yahei (property manager)                     | Kaneya Tokubei     | + |  |
| <b>In <i>Mōshiwase ren'in-chō</i>, 18 names, numbered 53 to 70 in this list, appear.</b>                   |                                       |   |                    |   |  |
| 47   | Edobori 5                             | Ōbaya Jiroemon  | Skaiya Otojirō     | + |  |
| 48   | Sonezaki-mura, Uchishinchi 2 Uramachi | Fujiya Tomekichi                                      | Osakaya Mankichi   | + |  |
| 49   | Tenma Watayamachi                     | Yamatoya Kyūbei                                       | Harimaya Isuke     | + |  |
| 50   | Sonezaki-mura (Nagaike)               | Masuya Wasuke   | Wataya Jōkichi     | + |  |
| 51   | Edobori 4                             | Satsumaya Kyūbei (property manager)                   | Yamadaya Ichibei   | + | Not mentioned in <i>Mōshiwase ren'in-chō</i>                                 |
| 52   | Kyūzaemonmachi                        | Ōkuboya Kichibei (property manager)                   | Yamatoya Kikichi   |   | Seal pressed instead by Chōbei, not mentioned in <i>Mōshiwase ren'in-chō</i> |
| <b>Next page<br/>(in <i>Shikimoku-chō</i>, following entries are mentioned only by name and signature)</b> |                                       |   |                    |   |  |
| 53   | Tamazawamachi                         | (homeowner)   | Harimaya Gorobei   | + | No sign in <i>Mōshiwase ren'in-chō</i>                                       |
| 54   | Daizubamachi                          | Minatoya Tahei (property manager)                     | Shin'ya Gohei      | + |  |

|    |                       |  |                     |   |  |
|----|-----------------------|--|---------------------|---|--|
| 55 | Nishitarumachi        | Wataya rihachi<br>(property manager)                   | Kishinamiya Zensuke | + |  |
| 56 | Yaheimachi            | Sakaiya Heibei<br>(property manager)                   | Tanbaya Yasuke      | + |  |
| 57 | Kyōbashi 5            | Tachibanaya Ihei<br>(property manager)                 | Tachibanaya Gihei   | + | Paper attachment by Chūbei   |
| 58 | Oguramachi            | Taniya Buhei   | Naraya Jūbei        | + |  |
| 59 | Gusokuyamachi         | Yamatoya Sahei<br>(property manager)                   | Ibarakiya Teijirō   |   | Blank paper attachment to shop name (no signature)                       |
| 60 | Kanedamachi           | Naraya Ichibei   | Nakamura Tokubei    |   | Blank paper attachment to shop name (no signature)                       |
| 61 | Matsuya Omotemachi    | Matsumotoya Tane,<br>(stamp pressed instead by Chōbei) | Kinokuniya Chūbei   | + |  |
| 62 | Aburamachi 1          | Shioya Rihei<br>(property manager)                     | Izumiya Genbei      | + |  |
| 63 | Minami Nurishiyamachi | Wataya Sukejirō<br>(property manager)                  | Sasaya Hikosaburō   | + |  |
| 64 | Sōemonmachi           | Kawachiya Heijirō<br>(property manager)                | Hiranoya Chōbei     |   | Paper attachment for resignation (no signature)                          |
| 65 | Sōemonmachi           | Zōgeya Matsusuke<br>(property manager)                 | Yamatoya Chōsaburō  |   | Paper attachment for resignation (no signature)                          |
| 66 | Suōmachi              | Fushimiya Zenbei                                       | Kiya Gohei          |   | Paper attachment for resignation (no signature)                          |
| 67 | Sumiyamachi           | Harimaya Jihei<br>(property manager)                   | Izumiya Yasujirō    | + | Stamp pressed instead by Mohei, above which is paper attachment by Kahei |
| 68 | Obamamachi            | Kasaya Matabei<br>(property manager)                   | Shimaya Tōbei       | + |  |
| 69 | Kita Horie 2          | Hiranoya Shinbei<br>(property manager)                 | Kamiya Yasuke       | + |  |
| 70 | Kyūzaemonmachi        | (homeowner)  | Mikawayama Gijirō   |   | Blank paper attachment to shop name (no signature)                       |

| Brushstrokes change from here (the following may have been added later) |                  |  |                   |   |                                      |
|---|------------------|--|-------------------|---|--------------------------------------|
| 71  | Tanimachi 1      | Tadaya Shinsuke<br>(property manager)  | Izumiya Tōsuke    | + |                                      |
| 72  | Tsuchinanbamachi | Harimaya Tōbei                         | Yoshinoya Kanbei  | + |                                      |
| 73  | Sumiyamachi      | Toshimaya Shichibei                    | Kitakazeya Kihei  | + |                                      |
| 74  | Kyūzaemonmachi   | Ōkuboya Kichibei<br>(property manager) | Osakaya Genzaburō | + |                                      |
| 75  | Dōchinmachi      | Imazuya Kisuke<br>(property manager)   | Itamiya Inosuke   | + | Seal pressed<br>instead by<br>Yahei  |
| 76  | Yamatomachi      | Kawachiya Denbei<br>(property manager) | Itamiya Tokumatsu | + |                                      |
| 77  | Kyūzaemonmachi   | Ōkuboya Kichibei<br>(property manager) | Yamatoya Kikichi  | + | Seal pressed<br>instead by<br>Chōbei |

Source: *Shikimoku-chō* of *Hōkōnin kuchiire toseininchū* of the first month of Ansei 2 (1855) supplemented by the information of *Mōshiwase ren'in-chō*.

**Table 3: Rules Concerning Payments to Public Institutions and Officials Made by *Hōkōnin Kuchiire Tosei Ninchū***

| Payment to the governor's office       |  |                                     |
|--|--|-------------------------------------|
| [Official]                             | [Number of officials<br>(with other titles)] | [Unit of payment*]                  |
| East and west <i>bugyō</i> (governors) | [2]  | 100 <i>hiki</i> of gold per person  |
| East and west <i>karō</i>              | 4  | 3 <i>momme</i> of silver per person |
| East and West <i>yoriki</i>            | 8 <i>jikatayaku</i>                          | 1 <i>ryō</i> of silver per person   |
|  | 6 <i>tōzokukata</i>                          | 3 <i>momme</i> of silver per person |
| East and West <i>dōshin</i>            | 2 <i>metsuke</i>                             | 2 <i>momme</i> of silver per person |
|  | 10 <i>jikatayaku</i>                         | 2 <i>momme</i> of silver per person |
|  | 16 <i>tōzokukata</i>                         | 2 <i>momme</i> of silver per person |

| Payment to the three district communities [kumi] of Osaka |   |   |                             |                             |
|---|---|---|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| [Official]  | [Unit of payment]                                 | [Number of officials and amount of payment] |                             |                             |
|   |   | Kita- <i>gumi</i> **                        | Minami- <i>gumi</i>         | Temma- <i>gumi</i>          |
| Sōtoshiyori   | 1 <i>ryō</i> of silver<br>(one packet per person) | 5 (1 <i>ryō</i> per person)                 | 4 (1 <i>ryō</i> per person) | 3 (1 <i>ryō</i> per person) |
| Sōdai   | 2 <i>momme</i> of silver<br>(one packet for all)  | 7 (14 <i>momme</i> )                        | 6 (12 <i>momme</i> )        | 4 (8 <i>momme</i> )         |
| Monokaki  | 2 <i>momme</i> of silver<br>(one packet for all)  | 6 (12 <i>momme</i> )                        | 6 (12 <i>momme</i> )        | 6 (12 <i>momme</i> )        |
| Wakashūchū  | 1 <i>momme</i> of silver<br>(one packet for all)  | 7 (7 <i>momme</i> )                         | 6 (6 <i>momme</i> )         | 4 (4 <i>momme</i> )         |
| Kozukaishūchū   | (no rules for them)                               | 3 <i>momme</i> packet                       | 3 <i>momme</i> packet       | 3 <i>momme</i> packet       |

| [Official] | [Number of officials<br>(with other titles)] | [Unit of payment*]                  |
|------------|--|-------------------------------------|
| Ometsuke   | 2 <i>tesaki</i>                              | 2 <i>momme</i> of silver per person |

Notes: It is stated at the end that 'these sums will be paid on the first day of the first and eighth months every year.

\* *Hiki*, *momme* and *ryō* are units of currency. \*\* *Gumi* is a euphonic variation of *kumi*.

Source: *Shikimoku-chō* of *Hōkōnin kuchiire tosei ninchū* of the first month of Ansei 2.

## ***Mōshiwase Ren'in-chō***

Next, I would like to examine *Mōshiwase ren'in-chō*, the second directory compiled by the guild. It contains agreements of guild members and illustrates the characters of the guild. First of all, I would like to quote the agreement section.

### Agreements

Article: We will not introduce anybody to employment as a *hōkōnin* without verifying his/her birthplace beforehand.

Article: We will not lodge anybody thoughtlessly under the pretext of the *degawari* of *hōkōnin*. We will be careful that there are no quarrels or arguments.

Article: When we introduce employment, we will refrain from behaving improperly and pursuing only our own profits without paying attention to problems this may cause to *hōkōnin* themselves or to their parents. We will always strive to behave honestly and righteously.

Article: If we carry out business with fellow employment agents, we will never act to cause problems to our partners.

Article: If a *hōkōnin* commits theft and runs away from his/her employer during the trial period, we will immediately notify all of our members. If we see a similar person, we will notify other members.

We will observe all of our agreements mentioned above. If any of us disobey them, we agree that the person be excluded from the guild. As a sign of our agreements, we will stamp our seals hereafter.

The first month of Ansei 2, the Year of the Little Wood and Rabbit

Azuchimachi 2-chome Harimaya Kakubei *shihai kariya* [managing the house rented by]

Tanakaya Kyūemon (seal)

[The subsequent signatures and seals are omitted.]

After the description of these agreements, the signatures and seals of the guild members are listed with Tanakaya Kyūemon at the head of the list. They are basically the same people as those who signed *Shikimoku-chō* and are listed in Table 2. The clause that an offender against the agreements would be excluded from the guild shows an independent character of the guild. Although the contents of the agreements are not very different from the instructions of *machibure*, it is important that the agreements took shape spontaneously among the guild members.

The second article states that these agents should not lodge anybody thoughtlessly under the pretext of the *degawari* of *hōkōnin*. This is worth while noting in two respects. First, the article implies that *degawari hōkōnin* were their most important business targets. The targets were not necessarily limited to *buke hōkōnin* but consisted mainly of broader *hiyōsō*. Second, the article assumes that it was normal practice to lodge *degawari hōkōnin* while they were looking for new employment. This means that at that stage the business of employment agents and the function of lodging were closely related, indicating that these practices were somehow rooted in *hitoyado* that had existed since the 17<sup>th</sup> century.

According to Table 2, only one among all the employment agents owned a house; all others were tenants. Many of them lived in Tenma, Nishi-senba, Horie and Shimanouchi, thus outside of the urban center of Osaka such as Senba.

## **Conclusion**

I have so far examined several aspects of *hitoyado*, *yado* with a function of *kuchiire* in the city of Osaka. They had undoubtedly emerged by the mid-17<sup>th</sup> century. They first acted as agents for *degawari hōkōnin* of the warrior class, especially of *banshū*. Although short-term *hōkōnin* for townspeople also already seemingly existed at that stage, they were still controlled together with *buke hōkōnin*, reflecting the homogeneity of the two types of *hōkōnin* as the labor forces (*hiyōsō*). By the 18<sup>th</sup> century, however, the importance of short-term *hōkōnin* for townspeople grew, and employment agents focusing on them also appeared. This is further attested by the fact that there was a guild of employment agents for sake producers. There were probably various types of *nakama* guilds which had developed independently although were not yet officially recognized by the governor's office. Taking advantage of the lack of official control, an applicant appeared for the post of *kimoiri* (*kuchiire*) *sōdai*, supervisor of employment agents. Through the act of opposing such a move, close ties among employment agents were probably forged. In Kansei 7 (1795), when the governor's office sought to control *degawari hōkōnin*, a guild of employment agents for

*hōkōnin* was officially recognized as *hōkōnin kuchiire tosei ninchū*.

This course of development resulted in the organization of employment agents listed in Table 2 at the end of the Shogunate period. Of course, there still existed spontaneously developed guilds such as *nakama* of the *kuchiire* for sake producers at the same point in time. However, it is not clear whether these two types of guilds were totally separate beings, whether they overlapped, or whether the latter was included in the former. This will be my future research theme, together with one concerning how these guilds developed into the institution called *yatoinin ukeyado* in the Meiji era.<sup>13</sup>

In this paper, I have focused on the fact that those mediating between urban lower classes and their employers such as warriors and merchants provided lodging services. By doing so, I have illustrated an important aspect of the workings of *yado* in the early modern age. It can be concluded that this aspect constituted an integral part of the social structure of Osaka's urban lower class.

## References

- Saga Ashita, 'The Lower Stratum of Urban Society in Early Modern Osaka' (in Japanese) in: *The Urban History Annual 10*, 2002
- Takagi Shosaku, 'Iwayuru "mibun hōrei" to "ikkiori" kinrei (The so-called 'Status Law' and prohibition of one-year contract)' (in Japanese) in: Bido Masahide sensei kanreki kinenkai (ed.) *Nihon kinseishi ronsō* (Papers on Japanese Early Modern History), vol. 1, Yoshikawa kōbunkan, 1984. Later included in: Takagi Shosaku, *Nihon kinsei kokkashi no kenkyū* (Research on the History of Japanese Early Modern State), Iwanami Shoten, 1990.
- Tsukada Takashi, 'Kinsei Osaka no machi to machibure ni tsuitenō danshō (A study on towns and *machibure* of Early modern Osaka)' (in Japanese) in: Hirokawa Tadahide (ed.) *Kindai Osaka no gyōsei, shakai, keizai* (Administration, Society and Economy of Early Modern Osaka), Aoki shoten, 1998. Later included in: *idem*, *Kinsei Osaka no toshi shakai* (Urban Society of Early Modern Osaka), Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 2006.
- Tsukada Takashi, *Rekishi no naka no Osaka* (Historical Osaka) (in Japanese), Iwanami Shoten, 2002
- Tsukada Takashi, 'Kinsei kōki Osaka ni okeru toshi kasō minshū no seikatsu sekai (Living environment of urban lower class in late Early modern age Osaka)' (in Japanese) in: Inoue Toru, Tsukada Takashi (eds.) *Higashi ajia kinsei toshi ni okeru shakaiteki ketsugō: shomibun, shokaisō no sonzai keitai* (Social Connection of Different Social Categories in Early Modern East Asian Towns), Seibundō, 2005.
- Nishimura Kazue, 'Kinsei Osaka sangō ieukenin nakama ni tsuite (On *ieukenin nakama* guild in the three communities of Early Modern Osaka)' (in Japanese) in: Tsukada Takashi, Yoshida Nobuyuki (eds.) *Kinsei Osaka no toshi kūkan to shakai kōzō* (*Urban Space and Social Structure in Early Modern Osaka*), Yamakawa Shuppansha, 2001.
- Yahisa Kenji, 'Traveler's Inns Serving Women of Hirakata Post Station in Late Early Modern Japan' (in Japanese) in: Urban Historical Society (ed.), *The Urban Historical Annual 7: The Characteristics of the Capital Cities*, Yamakawa Shuppansha, 1999.
- Yahisa Kenji, 'Kinsei Osaka no shuzō batarakinin kuchiireya nakama to toshi shakai (*Kuchiire nakama* guild for employers in sake production and urban society in Early modern Osaka)' (in Japanese) in: Tsukada Takashi (ed.) *Osaka ni okeru toshi no hatten to kōzō* (*Urban Development and its Structure in Osaka*), Yamakawa Shuppansha, 2004.
- Yoshida Nobuyuki, 'Nihon kinsei toshi kasō shakai no sonritsu kōzō (Structure of lower urban class in early modern Japan)' (in Japanese) in: *Rekishigaku kenkyū* (*Annual of the Historical Science Society of Japan*), special edition 534, 1984. Later included in: *idem*, *Kinsei toshi shakai no mibun kōzō* (*Social Stratification in Early Modern Urban Society*), Tokyo University Press, 1998.
- Yoshida Nobuyuki, 'Edo ni okeru yado no shosō (Different aspects of *yado* in Edo)' (in Japanese), in: *Rekishi no michi, saihakken* (*Historical Roads Rediscovered*) 2, Forum A, 1997. Later included in: *idem*, *Mibunteki shūen to shakai=bunka kōzō* (*Periphery of Social Stratification and Society as a Cultural Structure*), The Institute of the Buraku Problem, 2003.

## Editor's Note

This paper was translated by Ms. Takako Kimura (freelance translator) under the supervision of Takashi Yamazaki (Editorial Board). The English translation of the original Japanese paper is permitted by Yoshikawa Kōbunkan.

13. See Note 11.