APPENDIX

1. Administration

The administration of Tokugawa Japan was a complicated matter. Superficially, the highest authority in the land was that of the emperor, but in reality the governor of the country as a whole was the shogun he (or she) "appointed." As regards who became shogun, the emperor had no right to express an opinion, but the shogun sometimes attempted to bolster his legitimacy by marrying the emperor's daughter and making her his official wife, which implies that the emperor's existence could not be wholly ignored.

The position of shogun was inherited by sons of direct lineage, although in preparation for when there was no such descendent, three sons of the first Tokugawa shogun Ieyasu established branch families in Mito, Nagoya, and Wakayama called the *gosanke* (honorable three houses). The heads of these three branch houses were the highest-ranking of lords called "daimyo." Below the shogun were many other daimyo: those who swore allegiance to the Tokugawa family before the battle of Sekigahara, when the reins of government fell into the shogun's hands were called *fudai* daimyo, and those who became vassals thereafter were called *tozama* daimyo. While *fudai* daimyo bore obligations and rights to form a cabinet under the shogun, *tozama* daimyo were obliged to carry out civil engineering and construction projects throughout the land. Both kinds of daimyo had to journey every other year back and forth between their home territories and Edo (present-day Tokyo), and had to leave their wives and children as hostages in Edo. This practice was called *sankin kōtai*.

The areas in which the ordinary people lived comprised farming, fishing, and mountain villages normally called simply *mura*. These villages on average had a population of 400 to 500 people, and there were between 60,000 and 70,000 such *mura* throughout the land. *Mura* here has a quite different meaning from the English word "village," for the sense of community was very strong. Inhabitants of a *mura* felt a strong sense of identification with the other residents of the same *mura* and class conflict between the lord of territory and the tenants arose only occasionally. In this volume I have not translated the word as "village" when referring to specific place names, instead leaving *mura* as is as part of the name, but as a general term *mura* can still be called "villages."

The equivalents of small towns in the region were the *machi*. Again, I have not translated this as the English "town," but have retained *machi* as it appears in place names, although in a general sense they can be taken to be small towns. On the other hand, I have discussed the castle towns of the daimyo and the major urban centers of Edo, Osaka, and Kyoto without

appending any Japanese terms to those names. Because their character and content are so different, I hesitate to call them "cities." Rather, they can be regarded as large towns.

In each *mura* there was an official who supervised the village administration. His title varied among the domains, but was usually either *shōya* or *nanushi*. In nearly all domains, this official was selected either by election or appointment from among the people living in the village. Although he passed on orders to the villagers and presented petitions on their behalf, his most important function was to collect the annual tributes and various other taxes from the villagers as commanded by the domain, and to deliver them to the designated place and by the methods specified by the domain, by the appointed day. Furthermore, his duties included the compilation of various documents, for example, the SACs used as primary sources in this book (see Chapter 4), papers relating to the buying and selling of land, and those authorizing the pawning of property, etc. There were also domains in which *kumi*, organizations encompassing several villages, were formed, and an *ōjōya* appointed, but this was not true in all cases. There were village officials called *kumigashira* or *hyakushōdai* who assisted the *shōya* or *nanushi*, but their title was not fixed. In the *machi* as well, in the same way as for the *mura*, a town official was selected from among the inhabitants to supervise town administration.

The geographical unit above the *mura* and the *machi* was the *gun*. Some historians have translated *gun* as "county," but this is not a precise translation. The term *gun* was established long ago, in the seventh century, and has passed through several incarnations. Excluding the period when it was first established, it does not have any administrative meaning whatsoever, and came to be used as a word signifying a given territory. Even in the Tokugawa period, *gun* did not have any meaning other than to indicate a particular territory, and there were no occasions when officials were appointed to administer the *gun* as a unit. Herein, *gun* is used throughout as it appears in place names.

Above the *gun*, in the highest position, came the "province" or *kuni*. There were sixty-six *kuni* throughout the country during the Tokugawa period. Daimyo possessing territory on the scale of an entire province were called *kunimochi* (province-holding) daimyo, but the majority of daimyo had domains comprising one or several parts of a province.

This book examines the composition and changes in the population of a single region of Japan governed by such a regional administrative system, including the provinces of Mino, which was divided into several domains, and Owari.

2. The *Kokudaka* System

In addition to the above classifications, there was a social stratification among daimyo denoted by *kokudaka*, commensurate with the value of the land whose ownership rights

they had been bequeathed by the shogun. When, at the time of *sankin kōtai*, the daimyo held an audience with the shogun, how close they were permitted to approach was determined by this order (the higher the ranking, the closer). The *kokudaka* for each region was measured either by the Taiko Land Survey, which takes its name from the title "Taiko" held by Toyotomi Hideyoshi, who ruled Japan before the Tokugawa clan seized power, or else from a land survey implemented around the beginning of the Tokugawa era. The volume of rice was expressed by *kokudaka* (1 *koku*=5.1 U.S. bushels). For example, a 500,000 *koku* daimyo refers to a daimyo with (arable) land valued at 500,000 *koku*. Because the *kokudaka* of daimyo was the basis for the social ranking of the samurai of the Tokugawa period, theoretically daimyo could not initiate land surveys nor change their *kokudaka*. However, because it was possible to impose a tax on newly developed arable land only after a land survey was conducted, daimyo did indeed carry out land surveys and increase their *kokudaka*.

Incidentally, the *kokudaka* nationally was 18,000,000 *koku* in 1598, the year Toyotomi Hideyoshi died, 26,000,000 *koku* around 1700, and 32,000,000 *koku* around 1830. Of course these are official figures and do not represent the actual amount of rice production. Rather, they represent the value of the land as measured by rice bales (*koku*).

The daimyo with the largest *kokudaka* at 1,000,000 *koku* was the Kanazawa Maeda family, with territory comprising the three provinces of Kaga, Noto, and Etchu. Ranking below them were approximately 250 minor daimyo whose domains were worth 10,000 *koku* or less. Lords of territory of less than 10,000 *koku* were called *hatamoto*.

Each daimyo was tied by allegiance to his vassals, providing them with land or stipends. At first glance, this system may resemble the feudalism of medieval Europe. However, serious consideration must be paid to using this term in relation to Tokugawa Japan, since it is derived from the specific context of European history. In the case of Japan, a daimyo would be assigned territory somewhere within the country by command from the shogun, based on *kokudaka*. For example, in 1749, the daimyo of Oshi, Musashi province, was ordered to exchange his territory of 110,000 *koku* for land of equal worth in Himeji, Harima province, 800 kilometers away. There were many such cases of enforced transfers. Although there are theories that the reason why the shogun could order the daimyo to change their landholdings was because his political power was strong, I do not believe this to be so. In the case of Tokugawa Japan, the *kokudaka* system was the standard for determining such changes. Samurai also abandoned farming to become urban dwellers, and did not directly manage the labor of the peasants who lived within their territory as did European feudal lords.

So long as they did not harm bakufu interests, the administration of each territory was left up to individual daimyo, so that there was no uniform system. The extent of the administrative power wielded by daimyo led their territories to be called *han* (domains). Because it was the bakufu together with the domains that supervised the administration

of Tokugawa Japan as a totality, the term *bakuhan* system is used today to describe the national administrative system of the era.

The samurai and the peasants were separated both socially and by the district in which they lived, but there was movement between the two social classes via adoption and marriage alliance.

Kokudaka was used not only among the samurai class, but also by the peasant class. To begin with, all *mura* had a fixed *kokudaka* determined by land survey, and on average, most were of around 400 to 500 *koku*. This *mura kokudaka* formed the basis of the *muradaka*, by which the annual tributes were calculated and taxed, and the *daka* for any given region or province thus determined. (The annual village tributes in Tokugawa Japan were borne communally by the village, and not by individual peasants. This served to bond the residents of the *mura* into a community.)

Within the villages, when each household possessed arable land or building land, or both, as a rule, the *kokudaka* for each slice of land was calculated in accordance with the results of the land survey, and from this, the household survey or *mochidaka*, which formed the basic unit for the annual tribute and various other taxes, was calculated. However, the *mochidaka* was limited to land owned within the village, and, even if land was owned in another *mura*, the annual tribute was borne by that other village, and not by the village in which the owner actually lived.

3. Calendars, Eras, and Ages

Tokugawa Japan used a solar-lunar calendar to mark the passage of the seasons. The solar-lunar calendar has its origins in China, in which a month is determined by the waxing of the moon. In other words, a month is from one moon to the next. Although this was taken to be standard, a major month was comprised of 30 days, and a minor month 29 days, so it is not necessarily the case that the two are mutually interchangeable. A year was therefore either 354 or 355 days. However, no matter which it was, whenever a year passed in exactly this fashion, a gap of approximately 11 days would arise. In order to adjust for this, every two or three years, depending on circumstances, a leap month was inserted. The leap month always followed an ordinary month, so that it would be called the "leap third month," for example. Because a year with a leap month was comprised of either 384 or 385 days, the year would be approximately 8 percent longer than an ordinary year, creating a difference that cannot be ignored. Due to this difference in how the months were used, the months cannot accurately be translated as January, February, etc. It is more appropriate to refer to them as the first month, second month, and so forth, and that is the system I have employed in this book.

This calendar system began in China, and the Chinese emperor presented it to the rulers of those countries that paid tribute to China. It was eventually adopted by them and came to represent the identity of the relationship between the sovereign and dependent countries, since each country dispatched an envoy to bring home the calendar. However, Japan never sent any envoys to obtain the calendar. Rather, compilation of the calendar fell to a supervisor at the imperial court, who followed Chinese methods. Japan decided for herself the question of where to place the leap month. Furthermore, during the compilation of the calendar over a long period of time, only an error of a single day crept in. Since there was no overt connection with the imperial court in China during the Tokugawa period, no problems arose as a result.

Japan also utilizes era names, following a tradition by which a span of years is assigned a specific name. Currently, this accords with the period of the emperor's reign (the present emperor ascended to the throne in 1989, which is hence termed Heisei 1), but prior to 1868, names were attached to specific periods by the Kyoto nobility without regard for political events. For example, the second month of the fourth year of the Kyōwa era (Kyōwa 4; 1804) was designated as the first year of a new era called Bunka, and the Bunka era continued until the fourth month of the fifteenth year of Bunka (Bunka 15; 1818), when the era was renamed Bunsei.

As can be understood from these facts, a year in Japan does not agree with either the Julian or Gregorian calendars. The Japanese calendar is approximately one month behind the European year, and at times may even be two months behind. Consequently, an event that occurred in the twelfth month of a given year in the Japanese calendar falls in the January or February of the following year according to the Western calendar. As a result, the first year of the Bunka era (Bunka 1) cannot properly be regarded as being the same as 1804. In this book, however, the Japanese calendar is expressed in years corresponding to the Western year in which the era began.

The Japanese system for counting ages is based on the system common throughout northeast Asia. According to this method, a person is one-year-old at birth, and their age increases by adding one for each successive new year. In extreme cases, a child born at the year's end becomes two the next day. In this book, when age is expressed according to the Japanese traditional manner, it is given as "xx *sai*."

4. Sources

The major sources used in this book for population observations and analysis are known by the general appellation of *Shūmon aratame-chō*. *Shūmon aratame-chō* were called by a wide variety of different names during the Tokugawa period, but in this book I have

decided to refer to them by only one name, abbreviated as SAC. *Shūmon aratame-chō* may be translated directly as "religious faith investigation register." This source arose from the proscription of Christianity (more precisely, of Catholicism) by the Tokugawa bakufu. Catholicism began to spread throughout Japan from around the middle of the sixteenth century, but when national political unification was achieved by Toyotomi Hideyoshi and Tokugawa Ieyasu, it came to be viewed as heresy. Catholic teachings were regarded as being incompatible with the political ideals of the new government, which gradually led to the persecution of Christianity. The deciding factor in all of this was the "Shimabara and Amakusa Revolt," an armed insurrection by Christians which took place in the westernmost Kyushu in the autumn of 1637. The bakufu experienced great difficulty in quelling the revolt and thereafter adopted a policy of total proscription of Christianity. The famous "Closed Country"(*sakoku*) order was issued several times, but the final "Closed Country" order proclaimed in 1639 expelled all missionaries from Japan and forbade Japanese from traveling overseas and the Japanese who went overseas from returning home. It was exactly at this point in time that religious faith investigations began.

Specifically, each resident within Japan had to provide evidence that they were Buddhists, not Christians, and the results were recorded on SACs. The SACs were normally compiled on a fixed day of every year, usually by the official of the *mura* or *machi* and overseen by the domain lord. The names and family lines of each and every person living in the *mura* or *machi* were entered on the SAC, along with the seal of their parish temple, which was taken as proof of their Buddhist faith. Initially this law was applied only in territories under direct bakufu control, but, from 1671 onwards, it was also enforced in the territories of each individual daimyo, and SACs came to be compiled in this way.

Nevertheless, there are several problems associated with SACS which must be considered. Firstly, religious faith investigations were supposed to be carried out every year for all the residents in a *mura* or *machi*, but in actuality, there were many occasions when the investigation was conducted once every two years or even only once every six years, depending on the lord of the territory. Moreover, even though it claimed to target everyone, children under 8 *sai* were excluded, and there were even domains that excluded those under 15 *sai*.

Secondly, the contents recorded in the SACs are not uniform. For example, there are some in which age is not entered. These tend to be early SACs and SACs from the urban metropolises. From the point of view of these surveys, age was not a factor that needed to be recorded. Similarly, the *kokudaka* (value expressed in bales of rice: see Part II) for arable land owned by each household, which is frequently found in SACs from the latter half of the Tokugawa period, livestock, and so forth were superfluous entries from the literal objective of SACs. The fact that these items were often entered in SACs is because the SAC came to include items surveyed by population registers.

Thirdly, there are the principles of the compilation. Broadly speaking, there were

two such principles. The first was common to the majority of domains, and can be called "population *de jure*." This method records people born to each family and they continue to be entered in the SACs except in cases where they transferred legally to another family, such as by reason of marriage. Because people who left temporarily to work away from home, for example, continue to be entered, these SACs are characterized by a high number of the elderly. In other words, such SACs can be said to record the population *de jure* (in this book, **registered population**). Nevertheless, many SACs contain entries for servants who have entered into service in the village from another *mura*, for which reason they cannot be said to purely record the population *de jure*. This second principle of compilation can be called the "population *de facto*," (in this book, **resident population**) because in reality it records people actually living in the village at the time, and does not contain entries for those who have left to work away from home. SACs compiled using this method can be found both in lands directly controlled by the bakufu and in several daimyo-controlled territories.

This difference in compilation principle is significant when handling the data. For people undertaking historical demographic research using SACs, it is far more valuable to use those in which the population *de facto* is clearly recorded. However, it is still possible to use surveys of the population *de jure* as historical demographic sources.

Fourthly, SACs have both strong points and weak points. It is essential to be aware of both their pros and cons as population sources. Because SACs break down into household units in which are entered the constituent members of the given household in question, the same source can be used as a source for both historical demography and family history. Moreover, there are many cases in which the changes and the conditions between one year and the compilation of the SAC the following year are recorded. Thus, there is great merit in being able to conduct both cross-sectional analysis of a given year and time-series analysis of a given population group, such as individuals, couples, and households. By pursuing an individual life history, event history analysis is also possible.

However, due to the fact that this survey was targeted at people living at the time of its compilation, people who entered and then departed in between times are not, as a rule, always entered. What is most strongly affected by this fact is that infant mortality cannot be measured, because the documents were compiled on a fixed day of the year. Those infants who died before the first compilation after their birth do not appear on the SACs. This means that it is not possible to calculate birth and death rates, and infant mortality rates in particular. If one wants to determine these, one must use other sources that survey pregnancy and birth, or else to use statistical models to estimate these rates. Similarly, it is also difficult to determine the exact number of people entering and leaving a village. For example, with regards to the multitudes that moved to the cities, people who entered and left between the periods of SAC compilation do not appear in the sources.

Yet as a historical source for family history, SACs are highly usable and reliable data. In

almost all cases, the relation between the head of family and members is clearly recorded. Birth, death, marriage, divorce, and in- and out-migration are also noted. We can trace the life history of individuals through such events, and if we can obtain information about their land and livestock ownership, we can put together a picture of families before the modern age.

In sum, SACs are not perfect, but there is no better micro-data for learning about the lives of ordinary people in the past. In particular, where it is possible to use SACs that continue unbroken across a long period of time, or where many SACs still survive for a given region, their value is amplified many times. Although this book presents the results of research into a single region, the same type of research can be carried out for other regions in order to determine regional variations in the population, family composition, and changes therein, so that an overall picture of the social characteristics of traditional Japan can be drawn.

5. Japanese Eras and Gregorian Calendar Equivalents

Below is a list of selected Japanese eras referred in this book (alphabetical order):

Bunka 1 to 15	→	1804 to 1818
Bunsei 1 to 13	→	1818 to 1830
Genroku 1 to 17	→	1688 to 1704
Hōreki 1 to 14	→	1751 to 1764
Kyōho 1 to 21	→	1716 to 1736
Meiji 1 to 45	→	1868 to 1912
Tenmei 1 to 9	→	1781 to 1789
Tenpo 1 to 15	→	1830 to 1844