



The *hinin* and city wards of nineteenth-century Osaka

Takashi Tsukada

Graduate School of Literature and Human Sciences, Osaka City University, 3-3-138 Sugimoto Sumiyoshi-ku, Osaka-shi, Japan

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received 5 May 2012

Received in revised form date 6 June 2012

Accepted 8 June 2012

Available online 18 August 2012

Keywords:

Osaka

City neighborhoods

Hinin

ABSTRACT

From the mid-seventeenth century, with the formation of Osaka city, members of the *hinin* status group, an organization originally composed of beggars and indigents alienated from all forms of ownership, became established in urban society within an organization called the “kaito fraternity of the four places.” Over time, members of Osaka’s *hinin* fraternity secured the right to beg as a means of survival and were entrusted with the duty of policing and providing relief to the “new *hinin*” and “wild *hinin*” who emerged on the margins of the *hinin* status group. As an extension of those activities, the *hinin* fraternity also came to perform a range of official police duties under the authority of the City Magistrate’s Office. While members of the *hinin* fraternity possessed specialized begging rights and official duties, those rights and duties existed inside a broader network of social relationships. Namely, members of the fraternity were only able to survive by begging because they maintained relationships with city neighborhoods and townspeople that provided alms. Similarly, members of the *hinin* fraternity were only able to perform official duties because they maintained a relationship with the magistrate’s office, which ordered them to perform those duties, and with the individual neighborhoods that employed “*hinin* watchmen.” In this paper, I focus on how the will of Osaka’s townspeople restricted efforts by members of the *hinin* fraternity to redistribute begging rights during the nineteenth-century. By doing so, this paper highlights the stratified and composite nature of early modern Japan’s status society.

© 2012 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

Introduction

From the mid-seventeenth century, in parallel with the formation of the city of Osaka, persons of the *hinin* status, a status group originally composed of beggars and indigents alienated from all forms of ownership, became firmly established in urban society as the members of an organization known as the “*kaito* fraternity of the four places”. Over time, the members of Osaka’s *hinin* fraternity secured the right to beg as a means of survival and were entrusted with the duty of policing and providing relief to “new *hinin*” (*shinhinin*) and “wild *hinin*” (*nohinin*) who emerged on the margins of the *hinin* status group. As an extension of those activities, members of Osaka’s *hinin* fraternity also came to perform official police duties under the authority of the City Magistrate’s Office (*machi bugyō*).

While persons of the *hinin* status became firmly established in urban society as the members of a fraternity possessing specialized begging rights and official duties, those

rights and duties were only able to exist inside of a broader network of urban social relationships. Namely, members of Osaka’s *hinin* fraternity were only able to survive by begging because they maintained relationships with the city neighborhoods and townspeople that provided alms. Similarly, members of the *hinin* fraternity were only able to perform official duties because they maintained a relationship with the City Magistrate’s Office, which ordered them to perform those duties, and with the individual neighborhood’s that employed “*hinin* watchmen” (*kaitoban*).

In this paper, I will focus on the manner in which the will of the city neighborhoods and townspeople who provided alms influenced the relationship between Osaka’s townspeople and members of the *hinin* fraternity with regards to begging during the nineteenth-century, despite the fact that by that time begging rights in city neighborhoods had been established as the collective possession of the *hinin* fraternity. By doing so, this paper is able to highlight the stratified and composite nature of early modern Japan’s status society (Tsukada, 2010b).

Furthermore, in Osaka, there were more than 600 city neighborhoods (*chō*), which served as the basic unit of life for the urban masses. These 600 neighborhoods were

E-mail address: tsukada@lit.osaka-cu.ac.jp

aggregated into three large administrative districts—Kita district, Tenma district, and Minami district.¹

The buying and selling of *kaitoban* rights and the *kaito* fraternity

Each of Osaka's four *hinin* communities, or "*kaito*"—Tennōji, Tobita, Dōtonbori, and Tenma—had a three-tiered hierarchical structure. At the top, there was a single chief (*chōri*). Under the chief, there were a small number of sub-bosses or lieutenants (*kogashira*) (Tsukada, 2010b). Under the *kogashira*, there was a larger group of ordinary "hut-owning *hinin*" known as *wakakimono*. The members of these three strata formed families and employed one or more unmarried "new *hinin*" as subordinates, or *deshi*. These subordinates were dispatched to individual city neighborhoods and large merchant houses where they served as watchmen (*kaitoban*). However, *wakakimono* and other "hut-owning *hinin*" rather than the watchmen themselves held the authority to decide who was dispatched where. That authority crystallized in the form of "*kaitoban kabu*," or officially recognized rights to dispatch watchmen to specific city neighborhoods and merchant houses (Tsukada, 2001).

In the nineteenth-century, the Osaka City Magistrate's Office provided rewards to city residents who performed other acts of public service, such as apprehending criminals. Included among these individuals were a number of *hinin* watchmen. In fact, from extant records, we can identify 144 such watchmen.² On Map 1, I have indicated all of the *hinin* watchman for whom we can determine the *kaito* of origin of the sub-boss or *wakakimono* they served. As the distribution in the map indicates, while we can discern a definite concentration of subordinates of the Tenma *kaito* in the vicinity of Tenma district and a definite concentration of subordinates of the Dōtonbori *kaito* in the vicinity of the Shimanouchi area, as a whole, the territories controlled by each *kaito* overlapped. This territorial overlap is a product of the distinctive process whereby *hinin* watchmen became firmly established in urban society; however, I will not discuss it here.

Members of the *hinin* fraternity bought, sold, and pawned *kaitoban* rights. Let us begin by examining one example of a transaction of *kaitoban* rights. On the final day of the fourth month of Kyōhō 3 (1803), because he had just purchased "the right to dispatch a night watchman to the Surugamachi neighborhood" and the "right to dispatch a watchman to the Rikuraya *sake* merchant house in Kanzakichō" from *wakakimono* Genshichi, *wakakimono* Rokurōbē of the Tennōji *kaito* sent a petition to the honorable brotherhood of the Tennōji *kaito* in which he asked for approval of the transaction and requested that the "register of rights" (*kabu gochōmen*) be revised to reflect the change in ownership (*Hidden'in chōri monjo*, p. 551, *Chōri monjo kenkyūka* (2008)).

From this example, we can see that the right to dispatch watchmen was granted as the right to a single city neighborhood, as in the case of Surugamachi, or as the right to a single merchant house, as in the case of the Rikuraya mer-

chant house. Also, we can see that day and night watchmen were differentiated. Furthermore, within the *hinin* fraternity, *kaitoban* rights were also known as "neighborhood rights." The fact that they were referred to as such clearly indicates that the client relationships that individual *wakakimono* developed with specific city neighborhoods and townspeople came to be treated as a form of right. Furthermore, once a *wakakimono* had established a client relationship with a specific neighborhood, they received the exclusive right to beg there.

We know that the *kaitoban* rights mentioned in the example above were owned by *wakakimono* Genshichi and then purchased by another *wakakimono* named Rokurōbē. In addition, we know that the process whereby those rights were transacted was completed with a revision of the register of rights maintained by the "honorable brotherhood," or *onchū*, of the Tennōji *kaito*.³ It is important to note that no residents of Surugamachi or persons affiliated with the Rikuraya merchant house intervened at all in the transaction process. In a previous essay, I demonstrated that during the early modern period a tendency was widely observed whereby individuals established their rank or official position in the form of *kabu*, or rights, and then extricated themselves from the control of their employers or masters. This is a classic example of that tendency (Tsukada, 1997). Also, this fact itself can be considered one that displays the distinctive character of early modern status society.

This is one example, but similar types of records began to appear frequently between the late eighteenth- and nineteenth-centuries. The following document should help us to understand why that was the case (*Hidden'in monjo*, pp. 108–109, Okamoto Ryōichi and Uchida Kusuo (1987)). The document in question is an order issued by the leadership stratum of the Tennōji *kaito* to the *kaito's wakakimono* in the seventh month of Kansei 2 (1790). It also includes a pledge from the *kaito's* sub-bosses indicating that they will strictly observe the terms of the order. According to the document, the order mandated that from now on the buying, selling, and pawning of *kaitoban* rights would not be permitted. It stipulated, however, that when circumstances made a transaction unavoidable, the buyer and the seller should both submit a statement in writing to the "on-duty official" (*tōban*) and should have the register of rights revised in accordance with the terms of the transaction. In addition, it stipulated that when rights were being pawned, the pawner and pawnee should each submit written acknowledgments. The term "on-duty official" mentioned above refers to the member of the *kaito's* leadership stratum who was on-duty at the time that the transaction took place. Essentially, it means that written acknowledgments were submitted to the *kaito's* leadership stratum. In addition, the order's final clause stressed that members of the *kaito* should strictly observe this order because from now when it was discovered after the fact that rights had been privately exchanged or pawned, the *kaito's* leadership stratum would confiscate those rights. It should be noted that the procedures governing the buying and selling of rights differed slightly from the procedures governing the pawning of rights. Whereas in cases in which rights were bought

¹ For more on this, please refer to Tsukada (2002).

² For more on this topic, please refer to the addendum to chapter five of Tsukada (2007).

³ Each of early-modern Osaka's *kaito* was governed by its own "honorable brotherhood." Each brotherhood was composed of the *kaito's* chief and sub-bosses.



Map 1.

or sold it was stipulated that the register of rights ownership should be revised following the submission of a written acknowledgment of the sale, in cases in which rights were pawned and not accompanied by a transfer of ownership at the time of the transaction, it was only necessary to submit a written acknowledgment and no mention is made of revising the *kaito*'s register of rights.

While the beginning of the order states that the buying, selling, and pawning of *kaitoban* rights was prohibited, it then goes so far as to stipulate the procedures for buying, selling, and pawning rights by noting that when a transaction was unavoidable one could be initiated by submitting a written acknowledgment to the on-duty official. Effectively, therefore, the order in question amounted to an official acknowledgment on the part of the *kaito* fraternity of the buying, selling, and pawning of *kaitoban* rights. At the same time, it can also be considered an order that aimed to prohibit the private buying, selling, and pawning of *kaitoban* rights and to bring such transactions under the control of the *kaito*'s leadership stratum.

It is thought that *kaitoban* rights took shape during the second half of the eighteenth century and that the registers of rights, which were maintained by the leadership stratum of each *kaito*, came to be composed during the same period (*Hiden'in monjo*, Okamoto Ryōichi and Uchida Kusuo (1987) *Hiden'in chōri monjo Chōri monjo kenkyūkai* (2008)). In one sense, then, it is likely that by the late eighteenth century the buying, selling, and pawning of *kaitoban* rights was becoming increasingly common. However, from the text of the opening clause of the above document, we can also see that the leadership stratum of the *Tennōji kaito* held the belief that the buying, selling, and pawning of rights should be banned. However, conditions were such that practically speaking the trend of buying, selling, and pawning rights could not be stopped. Instead, therefore, the leadership strata of the *Tennōji kaito* attempted to control the trend by establishing formalized procedures for the buying, selling, and pawning of rights. As a result, this process concluded with an official acknowledgment on the part of the *kaito* fraternity of the buying, selling, and pawning of

rights. From the late eighteenth century, therefore, we begin to see large numbers of requests seeking a revision of the register of rights maintained by the leadership stratum of each *kaito* following the sale or inheritance of *kaitoban* rights. To put it differently, the late eighteenth century can be considered the period in which the management of transactions involving *kaitoban* rights came to be carried out in accordance with in-group status law.

Ward regulations and *hinin* watchmen

In the early modern city, wards or neighborhoods (*chō*) were self-governing bodies possessing their own sets of internal regulations. In a previous article, I suggested that when thinking about the urban laws that governed the city of Osaka it is necessary to divide those laws into three levels: ① public regulations that cover the entire space of the city, ② regulations that govern the various urban social groups internally, and ③ regulations that governed relations between those social groups (Tsukada, 2010a). Ward regulations and the regulations of the *kaito* fraternity are both examples of level ② laws.

From the perspective of ward residents, the *hinin* subordinates who were dispatched by the *hinin* fraternity to serve as ward watchman were part of a broader category that included “neighborhood attendants” (*chōdai*), “menials” (*shitayaku*), “night watchmen” (*yabannin*), “hairdressers” (*kamiyui*), and various other ward employees. For that reason, rules concerning the duties and behavior of *hinin* watchmen appear in some sets of ward regulations. For example, there is a set of ward regulations from the fifth month of Bunsei 5 (1822) for Shiragamachi, a ward straddling the Nagahori Canal in the northern part of Osaka’s Horie neighborhood (Tsukada, 2010a). That set of regulations is divided into two parts. The first part is entitled an “Agreement Concerning Ward Regulations.” It contains a set of rules for ward residents and a written agreement in which residents pledge to uphold those rules. The second part is entitled an “Annual Register of Orders for Ward Employees.” It includes separate sets of rules for ward attendants, night watchmen, hairdressers, and *hinin* watchmen. The specific rules and duties listed for each group differ significantly. However, in the sense that each set of rules contains a list of orders from the ward to an individual or group of individuals that it employed, these four documents are clearly distinct from the rules for ward residents contained in the first half of the document.

Of these four documents, the document containing orders for *kaitoban* established the following three provisions.

① *Kaitoban* must patrol the ward everyday to ensure that no “*hinin* beggars” (*hinin kotsujiki*) are allowed to loiter within the neighborhood or lay about under the eaves of the homes of local residents, along riversides, and on or under bridges. In addition, *hinin* watchmen must patrol the ward at night to watch out for fire and when a suspicious individual is seen wandering the ward they must drive the individual out. Because the ward will pay the *kaitoban* 6 *kan* 800 *mon* per month to cover day and night guard fees, their rice stipend, and their lamp oil costs, the *kaitoban* should faithfully

execute their duties.⁴ In addition, a portion of the guard fees should be distributed to the *wakakimono* employed by the *kaitoban* and *wakakimono* should conduct frequent patrols in the ward.

This first provision concerns the duties performed by and compensation paid to *kaitoban*. From this provision, we can see that the primary duty performed by *kaitoban* concerned the exclusion from the neighborhood of all begging activities by unauthorized “*hinin* beggars.”

② At the time of auspicious occasions (*kichiji*), Buddhist memorial services, and funerals, aggressive and disruptive begging is prohibited. In addition, alms will be provided in accordance with the means of the household where the occasion is occurring.

In addition to stipulating that a fixed amount of compensation would be provided to the *kaitoban* the time of both auspicious and inauspicious occasions, this second provision banned aggressive and disruptive begging on such occasions.

③ *Wakakimono* who are made to perform duties for the neighborhood are prohibited from wearing wooden clogs and leather-soled sandals.

The third provision concerns the footwear worn by *wakakimono*.

As the second provision indicates, *kaitoban* held the right to collect a certain amount of alms at the time of auspicious and inauspicious occasions. Moreover, that right is inextricably linked with the duty of prohibiting aggressive and disruptive begging by unauthorized *hinin* beggars. It also means that being employed as a *kaitoban* in a certain ward guaranteed a person the right to collect alms in that ward. That is why the right to dispatch one’s subordinates to a certain ward to serve as watchmen was treated within Osaka’s *hinin* fraternity as the right to collect alms in that ward.

These orders are addressed directly to the *kaitoban*. However, they also mention that *wakakimono* collected a portion of the wages paid by the ward to the *kaitoban* and fell under the authority of the *kaitoban*. As stated above, within the *hinin* fraternity, “hut-owning” *hinin* were called *wakakimono*, while the subordinates that they dispatched to specific city wards to serve as ward watchmen were known as *kaitoban*. However, in the above list of orders from Shiragamachi, the titles are actually reversed. Persons known as *wakakimono* within the *hinin* fraternity are referred to as *kaitoban*, while persons called *kaitoban* within the fraternity are referred to in ward regulations as *wakakimono*. The reversal of the titles *wakakimono* and *kaitoban* is also apparent in two other sets of nineteenth-century ward regulations: one from Kōraibashi 3-chōme ward and the other from Dōshōmachi 3-chōme ward (Tsukada 2007).⁵ In order to understand the meaning of these regulations, it is essential to consider this fact.

As the “Annual Register of Orders” examined above exemplifies, in early modern ward regulations, *hinin* watchmen, like ward attendants, night watchmen, and

⁴ Editor’s note: For more about the early modern Japanese currency system, please refer to the explanation in footnote 8 of Kanda Yutsuki’s article in this issue.

⁵ The regulations from Kōraibashi 3-chōme were composed in Bunka 9 (1812), while the regulations from Dōshōmachi 3-chōme were composed in Bunka 4 (1807).

hairdressers, were identified as employees of the ward. Notably, no mention is made in ward regulations at all of the existence of the *hinin* fraternity. At the same time, in the *hinin* fraternity's internal regulations, rules were established to govern the buying and selling of rights to dispatch *kaitoban* to specific city wards without regard for the will of the people living in those wards.

While there were also a large number of regulations of the third type mentioned above, which mutually restricted relations between the members of different status groups, in the above example, the *hinin* fraternity and city wards possessed divergent sets of internal regulations. In reality, therefore, the position of *kaitoban* was subject to two oppositional logics: the logic of the *hinin* fraternity from which *kaitoban* were dispatched and the logic of the city wards to which they were sent. In the following section, I would like to consider the problems that resulted from this discrepancy.

Conflict over *kaitoban* rights

In the third month of Bunsei 3 (1820), Matsu, the widow of Tennōji *kaito wakakimono* Monjirō, issued a request to the leadership stratum of the Tennōji *kaito* regarding her *kaitoban* rights. First, let us confirm the intent of her request (*Hidden'in chōri monjo*, p. 555, *Chōri monjo kenkyūkai* (2008)).

The right to dispatch day and night watchman to Kawaramachi 1-chō-me, which is formally owned by a *hinin* by the name of Matsu, was for many years held by Tennōji *kaito wakakimono* Jinpachi and is now in the control of his son, Jinpachi. However, Matsu is destitute and would like to have direct control over the right to send watchmen to Kawaramachi 1-chō-me. In an effort to regain control over her right, she attempted to negotiate with Tashichi through the mediation of another *hinin* by the name of Uhē. With the assistance of Uhē, Matsu requested that Tashichi provide her with an introduction to the residents of Kawaramachi 1-chō-me. However, Tashichi completely refused to cooperate. The mediator, Uhē, then advised Matsu's proxy Kisuke that he should go directly to the ward and personally ask for the rights back. In accordance with Uhē's advice, Kisuke went to visit the ward attendant of Kawaramachi 1-chō-me and requested an introduction to the ward on Matsu's behalf. However, because Kisuke did not receive a response, he went back to the ward a second time. On his second visit, the ward attendant suggested that Matsu and Tashichi should alternate control of the rights from month to month. Receiving the ward attendant's suggestion, Kisuke then went and negotiated with Tashichi. Securing Tashichi's approval, Kisuke submitted a jointly sealed petition to the ward, which explained that both parties had agreed to share *kaitoban* rights. However, upon submitting that petition, the ward attendant informed him, "The ward elders have refused to grant your request, so I have no choice but to return your petition." As a result, Kisuke had no other choice but to ask that Tashichi accompany him to the ward and mediate on Matsu's behalf. However, Tashichi refused to do so. It is likely that the ward elders refused Kisuke's request because Tashichi went to the ward and asked that control of the rights not be returned to Matsu. Therefore, I request that Jinpachi and Tashichi be summoned under the authority of the chief and sub-bosses of the Tennōji *kaito* and ordered to provide

Matsu with an introduction to the ward and to return her *kaitoban* rights.

The content of Matsu's petition is as described above. The course of events outlined in the petition reveals a number of interesting facts. First, members of Osaka's *hinin* fraternity engaged in the lending and borrowing of *kaitoban* rights. As the petition indicates, the *kaitoban* rights owned by Matsu were entrusted to Tennōji *kaito wakakimono* Jinpachi. Following her husband Monjirō's death, it is likely that as a woman Matsu was unable to perform the duties that *kaitoban* ownership entailed and was forced to entrust her rights to Jinpachi, who performed those duties in her stead. In cases in which the *kaitoban* rights of one *wakakimono* were entrusted to another, it is unclear whether or not the residents of the ward with which those rights were associated were aware that a change had taken place. From the ward's perspective, it did not matter who specifically carried out the duties of *kaitoban*. The only thing that mattered was whether or not those duties were properly executed. Therefore, whether or not *kaitoban* rights were bought, sold, or leased was an issue that was outside of the ward's realm of concern.

Second, when a person held the *kaitoban* rights to a specific ward and developed personal relationships with the residents of that ward, there were instances in which those relationships placed restrictions on the ownership and exchange of *kaitoban* rights within the *hinin* fraternity. As I noted above, the rights to dispatch *kaitoban* to specific city neighborhoods were bought and sold within the *hinin* fraternity and the residents of those neighborhoods did not interfere at all in such transactions. When the buyer and seller were both members of the *hinin* fraternity, a transaction of *kaitoban* rights could be completed simply by composing a written acknowledgment and by revising the rights register maintained in each *kaito* to reflect a change in ownership. Yet, even if ownership rights to specific ward were transferred as the result of a sale, that did not mean anything if the person who owned the rights was unable to actually dispatch their subordinates to that ward, collect guard wages, and garner the proceeds generated from the collection of alms. Namely, in order to achieve meaningful ownership of *kaitoban* rights, it was essential to receive recognition from the ward with which those rights were associated. In many cases, it is likely that city wards chose to recognize internal ownership arrangements established within the *hinin* fraternity. However, ultimately, the will of the ward exerted a restraining influence over ownership of *kaitoban* rights within the *hinin* fraternity. In such cases, when one *wakakimono* was temporarily entrusted with the *kaitoban* rights to a specific ward and then proceeded to establish an intimate relationship with the residents of that ward, a situation developed in which the actual owner of the rights could not contest another person's control over them simply by claiming that they were the rightful owner. For that reason, it was necessary for Matsu to request an introduction from Tashichi to the ward with which the rights were associated in order to get them back. However, Tashichi prevented her from doing so by using his relationship with the ward.

Now, while we confirmed that the will of the city ward exerted a restraining influence over the attainment of ownership of *kaitoban* rights, it was only possible for

wakakimono who were entrusted with the *kaitoban* rights for a certain ward to become established in that ward because they actually went there and conducted patrols. In other words, these disputes over control of *kaitoban* rights were only able to occur because *wakakimono* who owned the rights to a specific ward not only dispatched their subordinates to that ward to serve as guards, but also visited it personally on a daily basis.

Third, for that reason, in order to resolve her dispute with Jinpachi and Tashichi, Matsu requested that they be summoned under the authority of the chief and sub-bosses of the Tennōji *kaito* and ordered to return the *kaitoban* rights in question to her. If Tashichi had provided Matsu with an introduction to the ward and a dispute had been avoided, it is likely that Matsu's rights would have been returned and the necessary procedures would have been completed inside of the *hinin* fraternity. However, because Jinpachi and Tashichi fought back using their relationship with the ward, Matsu filed the above petition. In other words, Matsu persistently attempted to resolve her dispute with Jinpachi and Tashichi within the confines of the *hinin* fraternity. Thereby, she treated the issue as one that concerned only her relationship with other fraternity members. To put it differently, Matsu attempted to assert her own interests by deploying the logic of the *hinin* fraternity.

This example reveals a situation in which both the logic of the *hinin* fraternity, which attempted to maintain *kaitoban* rights as something governed exclusively by the internal regulations of the fraternity, and the logic of the ward, which attempted to subjugate *kaitoban* rights to the will of the ward by treating *hinin* watchmen as ward employees, operated and intermingled.

As I noted above, from the late eighteenth to the nineteenth-century, we begin to see a profusion of records requesting the sale of *kaitoban* rights and documents requesting a revision of the register of rights maintained by each *kaito*'s leadership stratum. Primarily, these requests were dealt with internally according to fraternity procedures. However, in the case of many of these requests, there are traces of evidence that indicate that the will of the ward shaped the existence of *kaitoban*, or *hinin* watchmen.

Let us look at one final example. In the eighth month of Tempō 3 (1832), Tennōji *kaito wakakimono* Kyūhachi

submitted a petition to the *kaito*'s honorable brotherhood in which he requested that the *kaito*'s register of rights be revised to reflect the fact that the residents of Kagoyamachi had agreed to restore his right to dispatch a daytime watchman to that ward. In addition, he was also granted the right to dispatch night watchman (*Hiden'in chōri monjo*, p. 556, *Chōri monjo kenkyūkai* (2008)). In cases in which a *wakakimono* attempted to reactivate a *kaitoban* right that they had stopped using, it was necessary to have the consent of the ward with which that right was associated. Despite the fact that previously Kyūhachi had only supplied the ward with day watchmen, on this occasion he secured the right to supply both day and night watchmen.

The relationship between Osaka's *hinin* fraternity and the city's wards during the nineteenth-century is one that exemplifies the stratified and composite nature of status society in early modern Japan. It is also one that displays the efficacy of the 'law and society' approach to historical analysis, which attempts to understand urban law in a comprehensive manner by dividing it into three distinct levels.

References

- Tsukada, Takashi (1997). *Kinsei mibunsei to shūen shakai*. Tokyo: Tokyo daigaku shuppan.
- Tsukada, Takashi (2001). *Toshi Ōsaka to hinin*. Tokyo: Yamakawa shuppansha.
- Tsukada, Takashi (2002). *Rekishi no naka no Ōsaka*. Tokyo: Iwanami shoten.
- Tsukada, Takashi (2007). *Kinsei Ōsaka no hinin to mibunteki shūen*. Kyoto: Buraku mondai kenkyūsho.
- Tsukada, Takashi (2010a). Toshihō. In Nobuyuki Yoshida & Tsuyoshi Itō (Eds.), *Dentō toshi 2 kenryoku to hegemonii*. Tokyo: Tokyo daigaku shuppankai.
- Tsukada, Takashi (2010b). *Kinsei mibun shakai no toraekata: yamakawa shuppansha kōkō nihonshi kyōkasho o tōshite*. Kyoto: Buraku mondai kenkyūsho.

Primary sources

- Chōri monjo kenkyūkai (Ed.). (2008). *Hiden'in chōri monjo*. Osaka: Kaihō shuppansha.
- Okamoto, Ryōichi, & Uchida, Kusuo (Eds.). (1987). *Hiden'in monjo*. Osaka: Seibundō.

Further reading

- Tsukada, Takashi (2011). Kinsei kōki Ōsaka ni okeru hinin no ie. In Norie Takazawa, Nobuyuki Yoshida, Joseph Ruggiu Francois, & Carre Guillaume (Eds.), *Dentō toshi o hikakusuru: iida to sharurubiru*. Tokyo: Yamakawa shuppansha.